This is a digitally signed Gazette, to verify click here.
https://rajpatra.hp.gov.in

# राजपत्र, हिमाचल प्रदेश

## हिमाचल प्रदेश राज्य शासन द्वारा प्रकाशित

शुक्रवार, 22 मई, 2026 / 01 ज्येष्ठ, 1948

हिमाचल प्रदेश सरकार

**SOCIAL JUSTICE & EMPOWERMENT DEPARTMENT**
**(Section-A)**

NOTIFICATION

*Shimla-02, the 13th May, 2026*

**No. SJE-A-F005/3/2021-I.—**The Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to constitute Directorate Level Committee for considering the report of Inspection Committee for registration of

Early Childhood Care and Education Centres, in the State, as per provision of Section 7(1) of "The Himachal Pradesh Early Childhood Care and Education Centres" (Registration and Regulation) Act, 2017 and Rule, 12 of "The Himachal Pradesh Early Childhood Care and Education Centres" (Registration and Regulation) Rules, 2026 as under:—

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| (i) | Director, Women and Child Development | *Chairman* |
| (ii) | Additional Director/Joint Director (Admin.) | *Member* |
| (iii) | Director School Education or his representative | *Member* |
| (iv) | Director (Health) or his representative | *Member* |
| (v) | Deputy Director (ICDS) (Women and Child Development). | *Member-Secretary* |

For consideration of the proposals received from the Inspection Committee, a quorum of 2/3 is mandatory.

By Order
Sd/-
(C.P. VERMA),
*Secretary (SJ&E).*

---

**HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA- 171 001**

NOTIFICATION

*Shimla, the 18th May, 2026*

**No. HHC/GAZ/14-405/2020.—**Hon'ble the Chief Justice has been pleased to grant *ex-post facto* sanction of 09 days' commuted leave *w.e.f.* 20-04-2026 to 28-04-2026 in favour of Smt. Anulekha Tanwar, Civil Judge-*cum*-JMFC, Court No. III, Una, H.P.

Certified that Smt. Anulekha Tanwar had joined the same post and at the same station from where she proceeded on leave, after expiry of the above period of leave.

Also certified that Smt. Anulekha Tanwar would have continued to hold the post of Civil Judge-*cum*-JMFC, Court No. III, Una, H.P. but for her proceeding on leave for the above period.

By order,
Sd/-
*Registrar General.*

---

**HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA- 171 001**

NOTIFICATION

*Shimla, the 18th May, 2026*

**No. HHC/GAZ/14-422/2022.—**Hon'ble the Chief Justice has been pleased to grant *ex-post facto* sanction of 02 days' commuted leave for 16-04-2026 and 17-04-2026 in favour of Sh. Shashi Kant, Civil Judge-*cum*-JMFC, Jawali, H.P.

Certified that Sh. Shashi Kant had joined the same post and at the same station from where he proceeded on leave, after expiry of the above period of leave.

Also certified that Sh. Shashi Kant would have continued to hold the post of Civil Judge-*cum*-JMFC, Jawali, H.P. but for his proceeding on leave for the above period.

By order,
Sd/-
*Registrar General.*

---

**HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA- 171 001**

NOTIFICATION

*Shimla, the 15th May, 2026*

**No. HHC/GAZ/14-324/2011.—**Hon'ble the Chief Justice has been pleased to grant 06 days' earned leave *w.e.f.* 15-05-2026 to 20-05-2026 in favour of Sh. Vishal Bhamnotra, Senior Civil Judge-*cum*-CJM, Kinnaur at Reckong Peo.

Certified that Sh. Vishal Bhamnotra is likely to join the same post and at the same station from where he proceeds on leave, after expiry of the above period of leave.

Also certified that Sh. Vishal Bhamnotra would continue to hold the post of Senior Civil Judge-*cum*-CJM, Kinnaur at Reckong Peo, but for his proceeding on leave for the above period.

By order,
Sd/-
*Registrar General.*

---

**HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA- 171 001**

NOTIFICATION

*Shimla, the 14th May, 2026*

**No. HHC/Estt.3(487)/98.—**20 days leave *i.e.* 01 day's earned leave for 16-04-2026 and 19 days commuted leave *w.e.f.* 17-04-2026 to 05-05-2026, is hereby sanctioned, *ex-post-facto*, in favour of Smt. Poonam Mahajan, Registrar (Establishment) of this Registry.

Certified that Smt. Poonam Mahajan has joined the same post and at the same station from where she had proceeded on leave after the expiry of the above leave period.

Certified that Smt. Poonam Mahajan would have continued to officiate the same post of Registrar (Establishment) but for her proceeding on leave.

By order,
Sd/-
*Registrar General.*

**LABOUR EMPLOYMENT & OVERSEAS PLACEMENT DEPARTMENT**

NOTIFICATION

*Shimla-171 002, the 20th April, 2026*

**No: LEP-E/1/2024.—**In exercise of the powers vested under section 17 (1) of the Industrial Disputes Act,1947, the Governor Himachal Pradesh is pleased to order the publication of awards of the following cases announced by the **Presiding Judge, Labour Court-*cum*-Industrial Tribunal, Dharamshala, H.P.** on the website of the Printing & Stationery Department, Himachal Pradesh *i.e.* **"e-Gazette":—**

| Sl. No. | Case No. | Petitioner | Respondent | Date of Award/ Orders |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | 77/23 | Susheel Kumar | Sanpras Corporate Co. Ltd. & other | 19-02-2026 |
| 2. | 99/21 | Vikram Singh | M/S Tidal Lab & Others | 26-02-2026 |
| 3. | 100/21 | Pradeep Kumar | - Do -- | 26-02-2026 |
| 4. | 92/23 | Narinder Kumar | The D.F.O. Joginder Nagar | 26-02-2026 |
| 5. | 08/25 | Bimla Devi | Director Health Service Shimla & other | 26-02-2026 |
| 6. | 10/25 | Savitri Devi | Director Health Service Shimla & other | 26-02-2026 |
| 7. | 691/16 | Piar Chand | M/S Om Hydro Corp. Ltd. & other | 26-02-2026 |

By order,

PRIYANKA BASU INGTY,
*Secretary (Lab. Emp. & O.P.).*

**IN THE COURT OF PARVEEN CHAUHAN, PRESIDING JUDGE, LABOUR COURT-**CUM**-INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, KANGRA AT DHARAMSHALA (H.P.)**

Reference No. : 77/2023
Date of Institution : 31-3-2023
Date of Decision : 19-2-2026

Shri Susheel Kumar s/o Shri Uttam Chand, r/o Village Bhatoli, P.O. Soldah, Up Tehsil Kotla, District Kangra, H.P. ..*Petitioner.*

*Versus*

1. Sanpras Corporate Capital (Regd. Office) 115/1& 115/29, 6th Floor, Sheraton Tower, Financial, District Narakramguda, Gachlbowil, Hyderabad-500 032, India through its General Manager.

2. The Manager (HR & Admn.), Indira Priyadarshini Hydro Power Pvt. Ltd. Village and P.O. Sidhpur, Tehsil Dharamshala, District Kangra, H.P.

3. The General Manager, (Administration/Project Manager) M/s Tissa Hydro Power Project Pvt. Ltd. Village and P.O. Khaniyara, Tehsil Dharamshala, District Kangra, H.P.

. . *Respondents.*

**Direct Claim Petition under Section 10 read with Section 2(A) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947**

For the Petitioner : Sh. Ashwani Kumar, Ld. Adv.

For Respondent No. 3 : Ms. Arti, Ld. Adv.
For Respondent(s) No. 1 & 2 : Already exparte

**AWARD**

This is a direct claim petition under Section 10 read with Section 2(A) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 filed on behalf of the petitioner. The brief facts as stated in the claim petition are that the respondents needed to appoint and post some experienced drivers to run their project(s) smoothly and properly by plying their vehicles. It is asserted that the some drivers were to be appointed for which applications were called for from some experienced drivers. The petitioner was a matured and experienced person/driver who applied for the said post to the office of respondent no.1 who after test/interview was selected and appointed as driver to work under the respondents on permanent basis vide appointment Order No. BHPL/2006/13 dated 1-11-2006 and pay of the petitioner was fixed to be paid monthly Rs. 3740/- in total and the same was to be paid by the respondent no.1 to the petitioner every month for the above said work of the company. It is asserted that after rendering seven years and five months of service under the respondent no.1/company the petitioner was issued another letter by respondent No. 2/company working under respondent no.1 which concern is situated at Dharamshala namely Hydro Power Ltd. or vice-versa. The petitioner was transferred from one location to this location. It is asserted that the respondent No. 2 had issued regularization service letter *vide* REF/IHPPL?007/15 dated 1-4-2015 to the petitioner as a driver and as such he was designated as Driver by the respondent no.2 and petitioner was to be paid total monthly salary/wages by respondent no.2. The salary was fixed to be paid Rs.11000/- per month and vide this letter the petitioner was directed to report to Mr. P.V. Raman Raju at Indira Priyadarshini Hydro Power Pvt. Ltd. at site village Lunta (Sokni Da Kot Panchayat, P.O. Khaniyara, Tehsil Dharamshala, District Kangra, H.P. After that petitioner continued to work as driver at Sokni Da Kot and on 1-10-2016 respondent no. 2 again issued transfer orders dated 1-10-2016 to petitioner directing and transferring the services of petitioner from this company/project to concern/company of respondent no.1 and it was mentioned in the transfer order dated 1-10-2016 that the salary and other allowances etc. of the petitioner shall be paid from Dharamshala Hydro Power Ltd accounts. Thereafter on receipt of transfer order the petitioner continued to work as a driver *w.e.f.* 1-10-2016 upto 26-11-2018 but all of sudden respondent no.2 issued notice dated 26-11-2018 to petitioner regarding termination of the services of petitioner *w.e.f.* 31-12-2018 without any rhyme or reason. Neither the petitioner was served one month's notice nor any gratuity etc. and other EPF amounts due to the petitioner were paid which act of the respondents especially respondent no.1 was against the spirit of labour law. It is asserted that no reason was assigned to petitioner with regard to his performance of duties as driver efficiently and sincerely as well as act of misconduct during his service rendered under the respondents. It is asserted that during whole service career rendered by petitioner no single or oral warning, censure, reprimand etc. were conveyed to petitioner. Despite that the respondent no.1 had terminated the services of petitioner suo moto without assigning any reason. It is alleged that the junior drivers were appointed by respondent no.1 and the petitioner was ousted from service. It is alleged that formula of *'first come will go last and last come will go first"* was not adopted by the respondent no.1 at all. The act of the respondents was uncalled for beyond any reasons or rhyme especially when the petitioner rendered unblemished service of driver under respondents right from 1-11-2006 till 31st December, 2018. It is asserted that the services of petitioner were terminated without serving any one month's notice or one month's wages in lieu thereof. It is prayed that the claim of petitioner may be allowed and respondent no.1 in particular and respondents may be

directed to reinstate the services of petitioner forthwith along-with back arrears of pay and allowances till date due to him.

2. In reply to the claim petition filed on behalf of respondent no. 3 preliminary objections qua maintainability, jurisdiction, cause of action, locus standi, estopple and suppression of material facts have been raised. On merits, it is denied that the respondent no. 3 was needed to appoint and post some experienced drivers to run the project. It is asserted that the petitioner was appointed by respondent no.1 and not by respondent no. 3. It is asserted that neither the petitioner was appointed nor he was terminated by respondent no. 3. It is asserted that Tissa Hydro Power Private Limited had started business at Dharamshala in the year 2021. No appointment letter as well as termination letter and transfer letter were issued to petitioner by The Tissa Hydro Power Private Limited as the Tissa Hydro Power Private Limited was not concerned with the Dharamshala Hydro Power Limited and M/s Indira Priyadarshini Hydro Power Limited. It is asserted that the services of petitioner were never appointed and terminated by respondent no. 3 and there was no violation of labour law "first come will go last and last come will go first. In view of the above submissions the present claim is not maintainable and petitioner is not entitled for any relief as claimed. It is therefore prayed that the claim of the petitioner be dismissed with cost.

3. In rejoinder to the reply filed on behalf of respondent no. 3 preliminary objections were denied facts stated in the petition are reasserted and reaffirmed.

4. On the basis of the pleadings of the parties, the following issues were framed for adjudication and determination:-

1. Whether the termination of services of petitioner *w.e.f.* 26-11-2018 by the respondent is liable to be declared illegal and hence null and void, as alleged? ..*OPP.*

2. If issue no.1 is proved in affirmative, whether the petitioner is entitled to reinstatement with seniority, continuity, full back wages and all other consequential service benefits as claimed? ..*OPP.*

3. Whether the petition is not maintainable, as alleged? ..*OPR.*

4. Whether this court has no jurisdiction to decide the present reference? ..*OPR.*

5. Whether the petitioner has no enforceable cause of action to file the present claim? ..*OPR.*

6. Whether the petitioner is estopped by his act and conduct to file the claim, as alleged? ..*OPR.*

7. Whether the petitioner has no locus standi to file the present claim, as alleged? ..*OPR.*

8. Whether the petitioner has not come to the Court with clean hands and has suppressed the material facts, as alleged? ..*OPR.*

Relief.

5. The petitioner in order to prove his case has examined himself as PW1 and produced on record his affidavit Ext. PW1/A. He also produced on record copy of demand notice dated 20-

12-2022 Ext. P-1, copy of legal notice dated 31-12-2022 Ext. P-2, copy of legal notice dated 16-11-2022 Ex. P-3, postal receipts Ext. P-4, copy of appointment letter dated 1-11-2006 Ex. P-5, copy of letter dated 25-3-2014 Mark-A, copy of letter dated 1-4-2015 Ex.P-6, copy of transfer order dated 1-10-2016 Ex. P-7, copy of salary certificate Ext. P-8, copy of notice dated 26-11-2018 Ext.P-9, copy of application Mark-B, copy of application dated 1-8-2015 Mark-C, copy of complaint Mark-D, coy of letter regarding reinstatement of service Mark-E and copy of ID cards Mark-F & G. Petitioner has also examined one Shri Naresh Kumar, Labour Inspector-*cum*-Conciliation Officer Kangra at Dharamshala as PW2 by way of examination-in-chief. He stated that as per record Ex. P-1 demand notice, Ex. P10 postal receipts, Ex P11 conciliation proceedings, Ex. P12 certificate dated 15-3-2023, Ex. P13 complaint dated 26-3-2022 regarding illegal termination, Ext. P14 reply dated 12-6-2022 have been seen and these are real and true as per their record.

6. Respondent no.3 on the other hand has examined Shri N.V. Prudhvi Raju Mudunuri, Project Manager of M/s Tissa Hydro Power Project Pvt. Ltd as RW1 by way of affidavit Ext. RW1/A wherein he has reiterated the facts as stated in the reply. He has also produced on record documents i.e. full and final settlement Mark-A, copy of bank statement Mark-B, copy of application dated 1-8-2015 Mark-C and copy of debit voucher dated 27-8-2015 Mark-D. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondent no.3 has also produced on record copy of supplementary agreement Mark-E, copy of newspaper cutting published in Punjab Kesari dated 26 June, 2025 Mark-F, copy of order passed in Petition No.157 of 2025 dated 16-7-2025 Mark-G, copy of order passed in CP(IB) No.110/9/HDB/2019 dated 12-12-2019 Mark-H on behalf of respondent no.3 and closed evidence on behalf of respondent no.3.

7. I have heard the learned Counsel for the petitioner as well as learned Counsel for the respondent No. 3 at length and records perused.

8. For the reasons to be recorded hereinafter while discussing the issues for determination, my findings thereon are as under:

| | |
|---|---|
| Issue No. 1 | : No |
| Issue No. 2 | : No |
| Issue No. 3 | : Yes |
| Issue No. 4 | : Yes |
| Issue No. 5 | : Yes |
| Issue No. 6 | : Yes |
| Issue No. 7 | : Yes |
| Issue No. 8 | : Yes |
| Relief. | : Claim petition is dismissed per operative portion of the Award. |

## REASONS FOR FINDINGS

**Issues No. 1 and 2**

9. Both these issues are taken up together for the purpose of adjudication.

10. This direct claim has been filed by the petitioner against respondent no.1 Sanpras Corporate Capital, No. 2 Indira Priyadarshini Hydro Power Pvt. Ltd. Dharamshala and Tissa Hydro Power Project Pvt. Ltd. Dharamshala. The documents Ext. P5 produced by the petitioner is the appointment order (permanent) made in favour of the petitioner from Dharamhala Hydro Power Ltd. dated 1-11-2006. Mark-A is appointment order made by Indra Priyadarshini Hydro Power Pvt.

Ltd. in favour of the petitioner dated 25-3-2014. Ext. P6 is the order regarding regularization of the services of petitioner dated 1-4-2015 made by Indra Priyadarshini Hydro Power Pvt. Ltd. *Vide* Ext. P7 dated 1-10-2016 the services of petitioner were transferred by Indra Priyadarshini Hydro Power Pvt. Ltd. to Dharamshala Hydro Power Ltd. Ext. P8 is the salary certificate issued by Indra Priyadarshini Hydro Power Pvt. Ltd. certifying that the petitioner is working in the organization since April, 2004. Finally on 26-11-2018 *vide* Ext. P9 the Indira Priyadarshini Hydro Power Pvt. Ltd. had sent a final termination notice to the petitioner on account of financial distress. The above documents reveal that petitioner was working with respondent no.1 and respondent no. 2 since the year 2004 and respondent 1 as well as respondent no. 2 are practically same entities and common employer of the petitioner.

11. Petitioner has alleged his illegal termination without compliance with the mandatory provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. He has admitted receiving the termination notice and also the fact that the similar notices were received by other workers working in Indra Priyadarshini Hydro Power Pvt. Ltd.. He denied receiving the compensation of Rs. 52,771/-and also that the said amount was deposited in his account.

12. PW2 Shri Naresh Kumar, Labour Inspector has admitted that neither the appointment letter nor termination letter of the petitioner has been issued by the respondent no.3. Pertinent to mention here that respondents no.1 and 2 have failed to appear before this court and were proceeded ex parte during the proceedings. PW2 Shri Naresh Kumar has also admitted that as per his knowledge respondent no.2 has acquired by Manikaran Hydro Power. He is however unsure that respondent no.3 has no concerned with acquisition and employee carry forward. Manikaran Hydro Power has not been impleaded as party by the petitioner in this case.

13. RW1 Shri N V Prudhvi Raju Mudunuri has admitted that he has worked in Dharamshala Hydro Power Project from 2009 to 2021. He admits that site Manji-1 and Manji-II of the above project has been acquired by TISSA Hydro (respondent no. 3). He asserts that this acquisition was by way of auction. He also admits that the workers of Dharamshala Hydro Power Project who were working in Manji-I and Manji-II are still working in TISSA Hydro Power Project. The above statements do establish that sites belonging to respondent no. 1 Dharamshala Hydro Power Project were acquired by respondent no. 3 but this fact itself does not explicitly show any proof of transfer of liability of workmen who have been terminated by respondent no.1 and respondent no.2.

14. It is however important to peruse the documents of final settlement Mark-A and copy of bank statement Mark-B, copy of application dated 1-8-2015 Mark-C and copy of debit voucher dated 27-8-2018 Mark-D. Petitioner in his cross-examination has denied that he received any compensation amount in his account but above documents reflect otherwise. Learned Counsel for the petitioner has argued that documents mentioned above are not proved as per law by the respondents. These documents were tendered in examination-in-chief of RW1 Shri NV Prudhvi Raju Mudunuri and were not controverted by the learned counsel for the petitioner in his cross-examination. No suggestion was made to the effect that no amount has been deposited in the account of petitioner and the copy of bank statement produced by respondent does not belong to the petitioner. No question has been posed regarding authenticity of above mentioned documents by the petitioner. The above documents depict the payment of compensation to the petitioner under Section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act,1947 and also final withdrawal of gratuity at the behest of the petitioner. The claim of the petitioner is with regard his termination without following due process under the Industrial Disputes Act. Respondent no. 3 has produced the document which shift balance of probability in favour of the respondents. No doubt respondents no.1 and 2 had not appeared to present their case however the documents regarding payment of compensation, copy of bank statement and vouchers regarding withdrawal of gratuity amount do establish a case in favour

of the respondents. Petitioner has failed to controvert the above documents nor he has produced copy of his bank statement in order to controvert the documents produced by the respondents. Mere denial by the petitioner in his statement that he had not received compensation amount is not sufficient to prove the non compliance of mandatory provisions by the respondents. In the light of above oral and documentary evidence, it cannot be held that termination of the services of petitioner *w.e.f.* 26-11-2018 by the respondents was in violation of the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. Consequently petitioner is not entitled for the relief as claimed by him. Hence issues no.1 and 2 are decided in the favour of respondents and against the petitioner.

**Issues No. 3,4,5,6,7&8**

15. The onus of proving these issues was on the respondents. Petitioner in his deposition has clearly proved the documents regarding his employment with Dharamshala Hydro Power and Indra Priyadarshini Hydro Power Pvt. Ltd.. There is no document connecting the liability of the above mentioned respondents and respondent no.3. However the respondent no. 3 has produced the documents regarding full and final settlement of the petitioner and fact that petitioner has already claimed the said amount. In these circumstance present claim is not maintainable and petitioner has no enforceable cause of action and locus standi to file the present claim and petitioner having received full and final settlement had not approached the court with clean hands and he is not entitled for any discretion relief. All the issues are decided in the favour of respondents and against the petitioner.

**RELIEF**

16. In view of my discussion on the issues no. 1 to 8 above, the claim made on behalf of the petitioner is not maintainable and the same is dismissed. Parties are left to bear their costs. Parties are left to bear their costs.

17. The reference is answered in aforesaid terms. A copy of this Award be sent to the appropriate Government for publication in the official gazette. File after due completion be consigned to the Record Room.

Announced in the open Court today, this 19th day of February, 2026.

Sd/-
(PARVEEN CHAUHAN),
Presiding Judge,
*Labour Court*-cum-*Industrial Tribunal,*
*Kangra at Dharamshala (H.P.).*

---

**IN THE COURT OF PARVEEN CHAUHAN, PRESIDING JUDGE, LABOUR COURT-CUM-INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, KANGRA AT DHARAMSHALA (H.P.)**

Reference No. : 99/2021
Date of Institution : 16-9-2021
Date of Decision : 26-2-2026

Shri Vikram Singh s/o Shri Anant Ram, r/o Village Chugath, P.O. Proyian, Tehsil Bangana, District Una, H.P. . . *Petitioner.*

*Versus*

1. The Managing Director, M/S Tidal Laboratories Private Limited, Patch-5, Phase-2, Industrial Area Goalthai, District Bilaspur, H.P.

2. The Factory Manager, M/s Tidal Laboratories Private Limited, Patch-5, Phase-2, Industrial Area Goalthai, District Bilaspur, H.P. . . *Respondents.*

**Reference under Section 10 (1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947**

For the Petitioner : Sh. T.R. Bhardwaj, Ld. AR
For Respondent(s) : Sh. Anish J.P., Ld. Adv.

**AWARD**

The following industrial disputes has been received by this court for the purpose of adjudication from the appropriate authority/Joint Labour Commissioner:—

"Whether the termination of services of Shri Vikram Singh S/O Shri Anant Ram, R/O Village Chugath, P.O. Proyian, Tehsil Bangana, District Una, H.P. *w.e.f.* 18-07-2020 (as alleged by workman) by (i) the Managing Director, M/S Tidal Laboratories Private Limited, Patch-5, Phase-2, Industrial Area Goalthai, District Bilaspur, H.P. (ii) the Factory Manager, M/S Tidal Laboratories Private Limited, Patch-5, Phase-2, Industrial Area Goalthia, District Bilaspur, H.P. without complying with the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, is legal and justified? If not, what amount of back wages, seniority, past service benefits and compensation the above worker is entitled to from the above employers/management?"

2. The brief facts as stated in the claim petition are that petitioner was working with respondents Factory named as Tidal Laboratories Private Limited, Goalthai, District Bilaspur, as Electrician since 2.7.2018 continuously upto the date of illegal termination 18.7.2020 vide letter dated 9th July, 2020 and he (petitioner) was drawing wages @Rs. 14,500/- per month. It is asserted that there were certain genuine demands of workmen working with the respondents factory and just to fulfil the demands as well as redressal of grievances of the workmen, the petitioner along-with other co-workers has formed a branch of Himachal Pradesh Industrial Workers Union bearing registration no. 155, HO Saproon Solan, H.P. Branch Tidal Laboratory Pvt. Ltd. Workers Union Golthai, tehsil Sri Naina Devi, District Bilaspur, H.P. affiliated with AITUC and the meeting of general body meeting of workmen was held on 11th March, 2019 and the petitioner was elected as Branch President, Mr. Pradeep Kumar, Branch Senior Vice President and Shri Virender Singh was elected as Secretary of the above said union. It is asserted that the after formation of union demand notice under Section 2K of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 was served upon the respondents on 25-3-2019 regarding demands of the workmen of the factory raised by the union i.e. categorization of workmen, 25% increase in wages of workmen, implementation of provisions of EPF Act, 1952 and ESI Act, 1948, common canteen functioning, issue of I-Cards to all workmen, implementation of Model Standing Orders/Act, 1946 till the certification of the Standing Orders of the factory, 20% HRA, 10% conveyance allowance, 10% uniform allowance and implementation of rules and regulation meant for the contract labour. On the aforesaid demand notice conciliation proceedings were held before the Labour Officer-cum-Conciliation Officer which were attended by the petitioner along-with other office bearers of the union but no amicable settlement could be arrived during the conciliation proceedings and accordingly the Conciliation Officer submitted failure report to Labour Commissioner Himachal Pradesh and the appropriate government sent a reference to this court for adjudication vide notification dated 13-5-2020 which was registered as Reference No. 66/2020 and the same is pending before this court. It is alleged that after submission of

demands the respondents became vindictive/prejudiced towards the petitioner and president as well as branch secretary of the union and started repressive measures and threatened the petitioner and Shri Pradeep Kumar, Vice President and Sh. Virender Singh, Branch Secretary of union to refrain from trade union activities otherwise. The services shall be terminated by the factory management. It is alleged that the petitioner and other representatives of the union orally pointed out that factory management had violated the provisions of Minimum Wages Act and EPF Act as the management had not paid minimum wages to the workmen employed in the factory in semi-skilled, skilled and highly skilled categories as well as their EPF deduction was also not made since 2015 to 2018 however in some cases the EFP deduction was made on lower rate of wages instead of actual wages being drawn by the workmen. It is asserted that Labour Inspector and Labour Officer carried out inspection of the factory and they found irregularities and violation of payment of minimum wages and accordingly the Labour Inspector had filed the case before the Judicial Magistrate, Bilaspur bearing registration No. 15/2020 titled as State of H.P. through Labour Inspector vs. M/s Tidal Laboratories Pvt. Ltd which is still pending for adjudication. It is asserted that apart from the violation of EPF Act, 1952 the petitioner and Vice President of union had made written complaint to the Regional Provident Fund Commissioner who had initiated inquiry which is still in progress and RPFC has imposed fine of 5000/- on the respondent for non production of record which is evident from the copy of proceedings dated 6-2-2020 and 2-6-2021. It is asserted that the branch senior president Sh. Pardeep petitioner had also made complaint to the Chief Minister, H.P. on Chief Minister Help Line (online) bearing complaint no.90743 dated 24-10-2019 with regard to non payment/short payment of wages, overtime, issue of I-Cards, weekly off etc. against the respondent. It is alleged that respondent management terminated the services of contract workers and also curtailed the allowances being paid to the factory workmen. The union had again submitted another demand notice dated 6.11.2019 to the respondent management under Section 2K of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and copy of same was sent to the appropriate authorities i.e. Labour Commissioner, H.P., Labour Officer-*cum*-Conciliation Officer, Bilaspur, Deputy Commissioner, Bilaspur, Superintendent of Police, Bilaspur and SDM, Sri Naina Devi Ji at Swarghat etc. and in accordance with this demand notice the Labour Officer-cum-Conciliation Officer had started conciliation on the intervention of SDM, Shri Naina Devi Ji, Sawarghat. On 23-3-2020 the Central Government had declared complete lockdown and put curfew throughout the country due to Covid-19 pandemic for period of one month and same was further extended from time to time by the Government however due to this reason the petitioner could not attend duties *w.e.f.* 24-3-2020 to 7-5-2020 but no wages were paid by the respondent for the above said period. On 17.5.2020 petitioner received verbal message from respondent that he should come to office on 18.5.2020 and collect covid-19 pass for performing duty in the factory accordingly petitioner went to factory on 18.5.2020 but respondents did not allow him to enter the gate of factory and refused to issue covid-19 pass. On 18-5-2020 there was no proper cleaning and sanitization in the factory where the workers were working. Petitioner along-with other co-workmen had given a written letter to respondent management regarding Covid-19 pandemic and instructions issued by the Government. It is asserted that when workmen of the factory and union of workmen had raised demand for releasing wages of the workmen for lock down period of Covid-19 pandemic however petitioner on behalf of union asked respondent no.2 for release the same in accordance with the instruction of the Government of India but of no avail. It is asserted that the petitioner highlighted the genuine grievances of workmen working with the respondent through union but due to this reason respondents become more vindictive and revengeful towards the petitioner as well as other principle office bearers of the union. On 1-6-2020 petitioner again went to the factory for resuming his duty at 9AM but respondent no.2 had refused to accept his joining and did not allow him to enter the gate of the factory. It is alleged that respondent management had served show cause notice dated 1-6-2020 upon the petitioner through registered post. It is asserted that show cause notice was duly replied by the petitioner vide letter dated 10-6-2020. It is asserted that petitioner had written a letter dated 13-6-2020 to respondent asking the reason for termination of services/not allowing him to perform his duty which was replied by respondent vide letter dated 25-6-2020. The

respondent had served another show cause notice dated 18-6-2020 which was also replied by the petitioner *vide* letter dated 13-7-2020. Thereafter respondent no. 2 wrote a letter on 9th July, 2020 to the petitioner wherein respondent asked the petitioner to submit formal resignation not later than 15-7-2020 and if company did not receive any formal resignation letter before 17-7-2020 consider this letter as letter of termination *w.e.f.* 18-7-2020. It is alleged that termination of the services of petitioner *w.e.f.* 18-7-2020 by respondent no.2 was illegal and unjustified. After illegal termination of petitioner he has raised industrial dispute by way of serving demand notice dated 9-9-2020 upon the respondent and copy of the same was forwarded to Labour Officer-*cum*-Conciliation Officer Bilaspur but no amicable settlement could be arrived during the conciliation proceeding. It is alleged that the charges/allegations mentioned in show cause notices dated 1-6-2020, 2-6-2020, 18-6-2020 and 19-6-2020 were wrong, fabricated, baseless and coupled with oblique/ulterior motive and ill intention and vindictive attitude just to harass and curb down the trade union activities of petitioner being office bearer of the registered trade union. No opportunity of defense and personal hearing was provided/afforded to the petitioner and as such the action of respondent terminating the service of petitioner was against the principles of natural justice, illegal, unjustified and is in violation of the provisions of Model Standing Orders and Articles 14 & 16 of the Constitution of India. It is alleged that respondent management had not adhered to procedure as laid down in the Model Standing Orders made by the State Government of Himachal Pradesh under the Industrial Employment (Standing Orders) Act, 1946 prior to termination of the services of the petitioner. It is asserted that the petitioner had more than spotless continuous service with the respondent and there is settled law that illegal termination of service amounts to retrenchment and management had to comply with the provisions of Section 25 Clause F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 however in the present case the respondent had neither served one month's notice in writing to the petitioner as well as appropriate authority nor paid one month wages in lieu of notice period to the petitioner. No retrenchment compensation was paid to the petitioner on the last working day. No notice in prescribed manner was served upon the appropriate government as well as no prior approval was obtained from the competent/appropriate authority and as such the action of the respondent management regarding termination of the services of petitioner was illegal and clear cut violation of Section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. It is alleged that after terminating the services of petitioner respondent had engaged Mr. Ashok Kumar s/o Shri Hukam Chand as Electrician but no opportunity of re-employment was ever provided to the petitioner and action of respondents clearly violated the provisions of Section 25 Clause H of the Industrial Disputes Act. It is prayed that illegal order of termination dated 9-7-2020 passed by the respondents may be quashed and set aside and respondents may be directed to reinstate the services of petitioner *w.e.f.* 18-7-2020 *i.e.* from the date of his illegal termination along-with back wages, seniority and continuity of service as well as pay 10% compound interest on the amount of back wages being equitable relief as petitioner was remained unemployed since the date of his illegal termination.

3. In reply to the claim petition filed on behalf of respondents no.1 and 2 preliminary objections qua maintainability and estopple have been raised. On merits, it is admitted that petitioner had joined Tidal Laboratories Pvt. Ltd. *w.e.f.* 2-7-2018 till 17-7-2020 however termination of the petitioner was not illegal but the same was done after compliance of due process and providing due opportunity being heard. Moreover due to unauthorized absence and for instigated other workmen and obstructing other workmen from doing the duty etc. the petitioner remained under suspension too. It is alleged that there were no genuine demands of the workmen. It is asserted that respondent company had providing all basic amenities and facilities in accordance with framework of law. It is submitted that the matter with regard to employees' demands was negotiated and both the parties *i.e.* workers and management had resolved the same amicably. '*The workers and the company (Tidal Laboratories Pvt. Ltd.) have signed memorandum of settlement under Section18 (1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 on 02-07-2020'*. It is alleged that the respondents management had never violated any provisions of EPF Act. It is again submitted that settlement was arrived on 2-7-2020 and the workers and the factory management were working

together happily. It is submitted that all the allegations made were false and concocted. On 1-12-2015 the petitioner was appointed at factory address of respondent company as a Electrician and had continued his services till 17-7-2020 and he was drawing wages of Rs. 11,750/- per month along-with other incentives as per company policy. It is asserted that due to Covid-19 the respondent company was temporarily closed. It is asserted that in lieu of emergency situation respondent company resumed its activities at the factory after obtaining all necessary permission and followed MHA and District Administration Standard Operating Procedure/guidelines. It is asserted that in the month of May due to emergency situation as contribution to the national interest, the operation in the unit of respondent company was resumed and the workforce who were local residents was invited to join the duty. Since the petitioner was not a local resident for safety measures it was decided not to ask the petitioner to join duty. It is alleged that petitioner all of sudden started anti-establishment activity and tried to influence the work force not to join duties but the workers did not join his call. It is asserted that petitioner adopted means of tarnishing the reputation of the directors and goodwill of the company by spreading false remarks which inter alia included the respondent company doing atrocities on the labourers and compelling them to come to the company. It is asserted that petitioner through unauthorized union was causing hindrances and difficulties in the smooth operating of respondent company's operations disrupted the harmony, unity and peace as well as caused obstacles to working workers of the factory. It is asserted that various show cause notices were issued to the petitioner but no reasonable explanation was given by the petitioner with regard to his behaviour. It is asserted that principles of natural justice and standing orders and articles 14 and 16 of Indian Constitution were complied with as well as respondent management adhered to procedure as laid down before passing the termination order and no illegality or violation of the Act was made while terminating the petitioner. It is asserted that the provisions of Section 25 Clause F, H and Section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act were not applicable to petitioner in the present case. Other parawise averments made in the claim petition are denied and it is prayed that services of petitioner were terminated in accordance with law as well as adhering to the provisions of principles of natural justice. It is therefore prayed that the petition of the petitioner deserves to be dismissed.

4. In rejoinder to the reply filed on behalf of respondents preliminary objections were denied facts stated in the petition are reasserted and reaffirmed.

5. On the basis of the pleadings of the parties, the following issues were framed for adjudication and determination:-

1. Whether the services of the petitioner were illegally terminated *w.e.f.* 18.7.2020 by the respondents without complying with the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, as alleged? ..*OPP.*

2. If issue No.1 is proved in affirmative, whether the petitioner is entitled to back wages, seniority, compensation and past service benefits as claimed? ..*OPP.*

3. Whether the petition is not maintainable, as alleged? ..*OPR.*

4. Whether the petitioner is estopped by his act and conduct to file the claim, as alleged? ..*OPR.*

5. Relief.

6. The petitioner in order to prove his case has examined himself as PW1 and produced on record his affidavit Ext. PW1/A. He also produced on record documents i.e. copy of letter dated 9-7-2020 Ext. P1, copy of election notification Ext. P2, copy of demand notice dated 25-3-2019

Ext. P3, copy of reference dated 13-5-2020 Ext. P4, copy of summon Ext. P5, copy of daily order dated 6-2-2020 Ext. P6, copy of daily order dated 2.6.2021 Ext.P7, copy of complaint dated 24-10-2019 Ext. P8, copy of demand notice dated 6-11-2019 Ext. P9, copy of letter dated 12-12-2019 Ext. P10, copy of representation dated 18.5.2020 Ex. P11, copy of letter dated 1-6-2020 Ext. P12, copy of reply dated 10-6-2020 Ext.P13, copy of show cause notice dated 2-6-2020 Ext. P14, copy of reply dated 10-6-2020 Ext. P15, copy of show cause notice dated 18-6-2020 Ext. P16, copy of reply dated 13-7-2020 Ext. P17, copy of reply dated 15-7-2020 Ext. P18, copy of demand notice dated 9-9-2020 Ext. P19, copy of inquiry dated 27-4-2022 Ext. P20, copy of orders dated 4-3-2020 to 1-7-2020 Ext. P21 and copy of order dated 31-5-2024 Ext. P22.

7. Respondent on the other hand has examined Shri Sanjeev Kumar, Authorized Representative of respondent as RW1 by way of affidavit Ext. RW1/A wherein he has reiterated the facts as stated in the reply. He has also produced on record documents i.e. copy of authority letter Ext. RA, copy of resolution Ext. RB, copy of certificate of incorporation Ext. RC, copy of letter of Vikram Singh Ext. RD, copy of letter regarding complaint dated 18-5-2020 Ext. RE, copy of letter of workers dated 25-5-2020 Ext. RF and RG, copy of letter to Dy. SP dated 8-6-2020 Ext. RH, copy of letter to Dy. Commissioner Ext RI, copy of letter Dy. DSP dated 5-7-2020 Ext. RJ, copy of letter to Vikram Singh dated 9-7-2020 Ext. RK, copy of statement of full and final Ext. RL.

8. I have heard the learned Counsel for both the parties at length and records perused.

9. For the reasons to be recorded hereinafter while discussing the issues for determination, my findings thereon are as under:

| | |
|---|---|
| Issue No. 1 | : Yes |
| Issue No. 2 | : Decided accordingly |
| Issue No. 3 | : No |
| Issue No .4 | : No |
| Relief. | : Claim petition is partly allowed per operative portion of the Award. |

**REASONS FOR FINDINGS**

**Issue No.1**

10. It is not disputed fact that petitioner was working with respondents as an Electrician since 2-7-2018 till termination of his services on 18-7-2020. The petitioner was Branch President of H.P. Industrial Workers Union registration no. 155, HO Saproon Solan H.P. Branch Tidal Laboratory Pvt. Ltd. Workers Union Golthai which was formed to get redressal of certain demands of workmen. Shri Pradeep Kumar was the Branch Senior Vice President and Shri Virender Singh was Secretary of the aforesaid union. The Branch Committee of the union had served a demand notice under Section 2K of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 upon the respondents on 25-3-2019 raising certain demands and copy of demand notice was sent to Labour Officer-*cum*-Conciliation Officer Bilaspur. Conciliation proceedings commenced and no amicable settlement was reached consequently failure report was sent to Labour Commissioner on 6-11-2019 and necessary reference was issued to Labour Court. It is alleged that on the complaint of petitioner and union certain irregularities were found and violation of Payment of Wages Act was discovered which led to registration of case No. 15/2020 before the Judicial Magistrate Bilaspur.

11. The petitioner has also alleged that union has raised the complaint for the violation of EPF Act, 1952 by the respondents. An inquiry was initiated against respondents company. Shri Pradeep Kumar had also preferred a complaint to Chief Minister of Himachal Pradesh alleging non payment of wages, overtime etc. In the light of above averments the petitioner has alleged that the

respondents became vindictive against him. Another complaint had been made by union qua illegal termination of contractual workers vide demand notice dated 6-11-2019. The petitioner during course of his cross-examination has denied that he along-with another persons had tried to stop the work and production of the factory and the workers understood his politically motivated intentions and were ready to enter into an agreement with the respondents. He has shown his ignorance with regard to compromise dated 2-7-2020. He has denied that respondent company had not violated any of the provisions of the EPF and another labour laws. He has denied that he along-with other union members had tried to tarnish the image of the company. He has also denied that he conducted an agitation during corona period though he admits that he raised a demand that the workers should be paid their wages during corona period when the factory was closed. He has denied that when he was called for work after lockdown he started spreading misinformation about the factory. However he has admitted Ext. R1 was written by him whereby he has asked the other workers to not to come for work. He has denied that on his incitement many workers stopped the work in the factory. He has admitted that notice dated 1-6-2020 Ext. R2 was issued to him by the company which he has refused to receive. He admits that he was not called for work by the company however he went to the gate of company. He also admits that on 2-6-2020 another show cause notice Ext. R3 was issued to him. He has denied that he tried to enter the premises of company during lockdown period and gave false news in newspaper that the company was exploiting the workers. He has admitted that he gave the reply Ext. R5 and Ext. R6 to the company. He also admitted that Ext. R7 was also issued by him to the company. He has denied that he received letter dated 25-6-2020 by way of registered post. He admits receiving letter Ext. R8.

12. The case of respondents is however put forward by RW1 Shri Sanjeev Kumar. The various disputes which have been raised by the respondent and as union against the respondent company have not been expressly denied though it is denied that company had violated the provisions of the EPF, payment of wages and other labour laws. He has denied that repressive measures or threats were given to office bearers of the union including the petitioner. He alleged that the petitioner and other office bearers had tried to tarnish the image of the company despite the fact that on amicable settlement was arrived between the respondents and workmen on 2-7-2020. On merits it is not denied that petitioner was appointed as a worker on 2-7-2018 and continued to work as electrician till the date of his termination. It is asserted that the petitioner was not local resident of the area where the factory was working with workforce during corona pandemic hence he was not allowed to join the duty. It is alleged that petitioner all of sudden started anti establishment activities and tried to influence the workforce not to join the duty such effort on the part of the petitioner have been futile as the company resumed its activities. He further alleges that petitioner tarnished the reputation of the directors and goodwill of the company by spreading false remarks alleging that the respondent company was doing atrocities of labourer and compelling them to come to company. Petitioner also alleged that cleanliness was not maintained and illegal activity was carried out by the company. Some of the workers who were requested to join were found absent without any reason and authorization which led to issuance of show cause notice on 16-5-2020. No reply was filed by the worker however petitioner filed a complaint on 18-5-2020 on behalf of absented workers. The petitioner had also filed a complaint against respondent company alleging that the premises of the company were un-clean and unsanitary and sent the same to the government authorities. An immediate reply was given by the respondents company on 18-5-2020 wherein it was mentioned that cleanliness was always the utmost priority of pharmaceutical manufacturing unit. The complaint was found to be false and vindictive and revengeful activity. He also alleges that petitioner thereafter started disrupting peace and proper working of the factory and made false claims. He instigated other workmen and approached the print media and published an article against respondent company on 25-5-2020. Petitioner along-with his union was causing hindrances and difficulties in the smooth operation of the company. Show cause notice was issued to petitioner on 1-6-2020 and investigation of allegations made on 25-5-2020. On 26-5-2020 another show cause notice was sent to the petitioner however petitioner refused to receive the show

cause notice dated 1-6-2020 in presence of Jasbir Sinigh. The petitioner was made aware that refusal to receive any official communication amounts to misconduct and attracts punishment despite repeated request the petitioner had not given reasonable explanation for his behaviour. He however started protest outside the premises of the factory on 2-6-2020. These protests were published in the local newspaper on 3-6-2020 whereby defamatory allegations were made against the company. Due to anti establishment activities of the petitioner i.e. another protest on 8-6-2020 the company had filed for police protection and approached print media on 7-6-2020. A reply was sent by petitioner to respondent company in lieu of show cause notice dated 1-6-2020. On 10-6-2020 another reply letter was sent by petitioner in lieu of another show cause notice dated 2-6-2020. The activity of petitioner against the company caused unrest in the factory premises and hindrances in smooth operation of the factory work. Company sent letter dated 11-6-2020 to Deputy Commissioner Bilaspur preventing the workers from the factory and disrupting the smooth functioning. On 18-6-2020 company had sent a reply to the petitioner dated 10-6-2020 stating that petitioner failed to submit reply of show cause notice and the reply was given by him was unsatisfactory. Respondents company gave three days time to come up with reasonable explanation failing which disciplinary action would be taken against him. On 25-6-2020 the respondent company in reply letter dated 13-6-2020 stated the averments about wrongful termination was false and frivolous and company also followed the rules and given enough opportunity to the petitioner to present himself. The activities of the petitioner against the respondent company did not stop even after several notices were issued to him. On 9-7-2020 after giving several chances and offer of resignation was sent to petitioner whereby he was given chance to resign from the company on or before 15-7-2020 and not later than 17-7-2020 along-with fair settlement amount of Rs. 14,692/-. It was also mentioned that in case he failed to submit his resignation the letter of termination would be treated as letter of termination *w.e.f.* 18-7-2020.

13. In his cross-examination this witness admitted that during period of his work with the company no formal complaint against the behaviour of the petitioner was received. He is not able to recall that on the date of termination of the petitioner a case was already pending before the court. He has admitted that no prior permission of the court was obtained while termination of the services of the petitioner. He has admitted that before termination of petitioner no one month's notice was ever issued to the petitioner. Though he states that information with regard to full and final payment was given to the petitioner. However he admits that no record of such payment offer is produced in the court. He admits that not retrenchment compensation was given to the petitioner. He has denied that opportunity of hearing was not afforded to the petitioner. He has admitted that no inquiry was conducted by respondent company with regard to the charge-sheet, written statement or affidavit containing allegations against the petitioner. He has admitted that the petitioner was terminated without any legal inquiry. He admits that company follows the Model Standing Order and rules. He has denied that company had compelled the petitioner to resign.

14. Learned Authorized Representative for the petitioner has vehemently argued that the services of the petitioner have been dispensed with in the background of vindictive and repressive attitude of the respondents because the petitioner was an agitating with regard to demands of the workers through his union. The various show cause notices have been issued to the petitioner however neither any charge-sheet was served on the petitioner nor any inquiry was conducted. The contention of the respondents regarding the termination of the petitioner on disciplinary grounds does not appear to be legal and justified.

15. Learned Counsel for the respondents has however argued that the petitioner had conducted various acts of indiscipline tarnishing the image of the company and also hindered the proper working of the company by inciting the workers and spreading misinformation. The reply to the show cause notice issued to the petitioner was not satisfactory and consequentially he was asked to resign failing which his services were terminated.

16. Section 2 (oo) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 describing the retrenchment as follows:-

"[ "retrenchment" means the termination by the employer of the service of a workman for any reason whatsoever, otherwise than as a punishment inflicted by way of disciplinary action but does not include - *[Inserted by Act 43 of 1953, Section 2 (w.e.f. 24-10-1953). ]*

(a) voluntary retirement of the workman; or(b)retirement of the workman on reaching the age of superannuation if the contract of employment between the employer and the workman concerned contains a stipulation in that behalf; or ]

[ termination of the service of the workman as a result of the non-renewal of the contract of employment between the employer and the workman concerned on its expiry or of such contract being terminated under a stipulation in that behalf contained therein; or] *[ Inserted by Act, 49 of 1984, Section 2 (w.e.f. 18-8-1984).]*

(c) [ termination of the service of a workman on the ground of continued ill-health; ] *[Inserted by Act 43 of 1953, Section 2 (w.e.f. 24-10-1953). ]"*

17. In the circumstances of the present case the petitioner has alleged illegal termination. Respondents have asserted that the termination was subsequent to disciplinary proceedings and admittedly the applicability of Model Standing Orders and Rules. In absence of any documents pertaining to the inquiry proceedings it is evident that the services of the petitioner were terminated without affording him due opportunity of defending himself. No inquiry was conducted in view of the allegations made against the petitioner. The respondents company while dispensing with the services of the petitioner has not followed the principles of natural justice. It is also established that there was no compliance of Section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. It is hence proved from the overall documentary and oral evidence that the services of the petitioner were illegally terminated in violation of the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and the principle of natural justices. Accordingly issue no.1 is decided partly in the favour of the petitioner.

**Issue No. 2**

18. It has been proved from the overwhelming evidence that the services of the petitioner were illegally terminated by the respondents without any compliance of the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. The petitioner in this case has claimed the back wages, seniority as well as compensation with regard to illegal termination. The overall circumstances of the case clearly show that the respondents have not followed the principles of natural justice as well as provision of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. In these circumstances the petitioner is held entitled to reinstatement to the similar post from the date of his termination along-with seniority, 50% of back wages and a compensation of Rs.1 lakh. Hence issue no.2 is decided accordingly.

**Issues No. 3 and 4**

19. The onus of proving these issues was on the respondents. The maintainability of the claim petition has been challenged on the ground that the termination of petitioner was after following due process an inquiry. However the facts contrary to these assertions have emerged from the evidence on the record. No such facts could be proved by the respondents which would lead this court to believe that petitioner is estopped from filing the claim by his act and conduct. Hence issues no.3 and 4 are decided in the favour of the petitioner and against the respondents.

**RELIEF**

20. In view of my discussion on the issues no. 1 to 4 above, the claim petition succeeds and is partly allowed. The petitioner is held entitled to reinstatement to the similar post from the date of his termination along-with seniority, 50% of back wages and compensation of Rs.1 lakh. Parties are left to bear their costs.

21. The reference is answered in aforesaid terms. A copy of this Award be sent to the appropriate Government for publication in the official gazette. File after due completion be consigned to the Record Room.

Announced in the open Court today, this 26th day of February, 2026

Sd/-
(PARVEEN CHAUHAN),
*Presiding Judge,*
*Labour Court-cum-Industrial Tribunal,*
*Kangra at Dharamshala (H.P.).*

---

**IN THE COURT OF PARVEEN CHAUHAN, PRESIDING JUDGE, LABOUR COURT-**CUM-**INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, KANGRA AT DHARAMSHALA (H.P.)**

Reference No. : 100/2021
Date of Institution : 16-9-2021
Date of Decision : 26-2-2026

Shri Pradeep Kumar s/o Shri Mulkh Raj, r/o Village Rani, P.O. Basi, Tehsil Naina Devi, District Bilaspur, H.P. ..*Petitione.*

1. The Managing Director, M/S Tidal Laboratories Private Limited, Patch-5, Phase-2, Industrial Area Goalthai, District Bilaspur, H.P.

2. The Factory Manager, M/s Tidal Laboratories Private Limited, Patch-5, Phase-2, Industrial Area Goalthai, District Bilaspur, H.P. ..*Respondents.*

**Reference under Section 10 (1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947**

For the Petitioner : Sh. T.R. Bhardwaj, Ld. AR
For Respondent(s) : Sh. Anish J.P., Ld. Adv.

**AWARD**

The following industrial disputes has been received by this court for the purpose of adjudication from the appropriate authority/Joint Labour Commissioner:—

"Whether the termination of services of Shri Pradeep Kumar S/O Shri Mulkh Raj, R/O Village Rani, P.O. Bassi, Tehsil Naina Devi, District Bilaspur, H.P. vide letter dated 09-07-2020 (as alleged by workman) by (i) the Managing Director, M/S Tidal Laboratories Private Limited, Patch-5, Phase-2, Industrial Area Goalthai, District Bilaspur, H.P. (ii) the Factory Manager, M/S

Tidal Laboratories Private Limited, Patch-5, Phase-2, Industrial Area Goalthia, District Bilaspur, H.P. without complying with the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, is legal and justified? If not, what amount of back wages, seniority, past service benefits and compensation the above worker is entitled to from the above employers/management?"

2. The brief facts as stated in the claim petition are that petitioner had working with respondents Factory named as Tidal Laboratories Private Limited, Goalthai, District Bilaspur, as Granulation Operator since 1-12-2015 continuously upto the date of illegal termination 18-7-2020 vide letter dated 9th July, 2020 and he (petitioner) was drawing wages @Rs.14,500/- per month. It is asserted that there was certain genuine demands of workmen working with the respondents factory and just to fulfil the demands as well as redressal of grievances of the workmen, the petitioner along-with other co-workers has formed a branch of Himachal Pradesh Industrial Workers Union bearing registration no.155, HO Saproon Solan H.P. Branch Tidal Laboratory Pvt. Ltd. Workers Union Golthai, tehsil Sri Naina Devi, District Bilaspur, H.P. affiliated with AITUC and the body meeting of workmen was held on 11th March, 2019. The petitioner was elected as Branch Senior Vice President, Mr. Vikram Singh, Branch President and Shri Virender Singh was elected as Secretary of the above said union. It is asserted that after formation of union demand notice under Section 2K of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 was served upon the respondents on 25-3-2019 regarding demands of the workmen of the factory raised by the union *i.e.* categorization of workmen, 25% increase in wages of workmen, implementation of provisions of EPF Act, 1952 and ESI Act, 1948, common canteen functioning, issue of I-Cards to all workmen, implementation of Model Standing Orders/Act, 1946 till the certification of the Standing Orders of the factory, 20% HRA, 10% conveyance allowance, 10% uniform allowance and implementation of rules and regulation meant for the contract labour. On the aforesaid demand notice conciliation proceedings were held before the Labour Officer-cum-Conciliation Officer which were attended by the petitioner along-with other office bearers of the union but no amicable settlement could be arrived during the conciliation proceedings and accordingly the Conciliation Officer submitted failure report to Labour Commissioner Himachal Pradesh and the appropriate government sent a reference to this court for adjudication vide notification dated 13-5-2020 which was registered as Reference No.66/2020 and the same is pending before this court. It is alleged that after submission of demands the respondents became vindictive/prejudiced towards the petitioner and president as well as branch secretary of the union and respondents started repressive measures and threatened the petitioner and Shri Vikram Singh, President and Sh. Virender Singh, Branch Secretary of union to refrain from trade union activities otherwise their services shall be terminated by the factory management. It is alleged that the petitioner and other representatives of the union orally pointed out that factory management had violated the provisions of Minimum Wages Act and EPF Act as the management had not paid minimum wages to the workmen employed in the factory in semi-skilled, skilled and highly skilled categories as well as their EPF deduction was also not made since 2015 to 2018 however in some case the EFP deduction was made on lower rate of wages instead of actual wages being drawn by the workmen. It is asserted that Labour Inspector and Labour Officer carried out inspection of the factory and they found irregularities and violation of payment of minimum wages and accordingly the Labour Inspector had filed the case before the Judicial Magistrate, Bilaspur bearing registration No.15/2020 titled as State of H.P. through Labour Inspector vs. M/s Tidal Laboratories Pvt. Ltd which is still pending for adjudication. It is asserted that apart from the violation of EPF Act, 1952 the petitioner and Vice President of union had made written complaint to the Regional Provident Fund Commissioner who had initiated inquiry which is still in progress and RPFC has imposed fine of 5000/- on the respondent for non production of record which is evident from the copy of proceedings dated 6-2-2020 and 2-6-2021. It is asserted that the petitioner had also made complaint to the Chief Minister, H.P. on Chief Minister Help Line (online) bearing complaint no.90743 dated 24-10-2019 with regard to non payment/short payment of wages, overtime, issue of I-Cards, weekly off etc. against the respondent. It is alleged that respondent management terminated the services of contract workers and also curtailed the

allowances being paid to the factory workmen. The union had again submitted another demand notice dated 6-11-2019 to the respondent management under Section 2K of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and copy of same was sent to the appropriate authorities i.e. Labour Commissioner, H.P., Labour Officer-*cum*-Conciliation Officer, Bilaspur, Deputy Commissioner, Bilaspur, Superintendent of Police, Bilaspur and SDM, Sri Naina Devi Ji at Swarghat etc. In accordance with this demand notice the Labour Officer-*cum*-Conciliation Officer had started conciliation on the intervention of SDM, Shri Naina Devi Ji, Sawarghat. On 22-3-2020 the Central Government had declared complete lockdown and put curfew throughout the country due to Covid-19 pandemic for period of one month and same was further extended from time to time by the Government however due to this reason the petitioner could not attend duties *w.e.f.* 24-3-2020 to 7-5-2020 but no wages were paid by the respondent for the above said period. It is asserted that respondent management has asked the petitioner to join duty during curfew but respondent management had handed over the pass to the petitioner through one of the factory worker namely Mr. Ram Pal on 8-5-2020 in the morning and after receiving the pass the petitioner went to factory and worked/performed his duty on 8-5-2020. On 9th May, 2020. On 9-5-2020 when petitioner came back to home after performing his duty in the evening the president of Gram Panchayat Bassi asked the petitioner to remain at home for 14 days till 17th May, 2020 as he had attended crimination/funeral ceremony of elder Aunt (Tayi ji) at village Chalola in District Una on 4-5-3030. The petitioner travelled to Chalola Village after obtaining curfew travelling pass from District Magistrate BIlaspur bearing Covid Pass No. HP89921 dated 4-5-2020 and the petitioner remained at home till 17-5-2020. On 18-5-2020 petitioner joined his duty but there was no proper cleaning and sanitization in the factory where the workers were working. Petitioner along-with other co-workmen had given a written letter to respondent management for regarding Covid-19 pandemic and instructions issued by the Government. It is asserted that when workmen of the factory and union of workmen had raised demand for releasing wages of the workmen for lock down period of Covid-19 pandemic however petitioner on behalf of union asked respondent no.2 for releasing the same in accordance with the instruction of the Government of India but of no avail. It is asserted that the petitioner highlighted the genuine grievances of workmen working with the respondent through union but due to this reason respondent become more vindictive and revengeful towards the petition as well as other principle office bearers of the union. On 19-5-2020 the services of petitioner were placed under suspension by the respondent management on false and fabricated charges illegally vide letter dated 19-5-2020. It is asserted that petitioner has represented to the respondent against the suspension vide written representation dated 19-5-2020 and also given written complaint with regard to illegal suspension to the Tehsildar, Sawarghat on 20-5-2020. It is asserted that respondent management had served charge-sheet to the petitioner vide letter dated 25.5.2020 with the direction to file reply for the same within two days. The petitioner submitted reply of charge-sheet to the respondent management on 26-5-2020. It is asserted that petitioner had also replied the written letter dated 27-5-2020 of the respondent on 29-5-2020. Thereafter vide letter dated 30-5-2020 respondent no.2 appointed Mr. P.K.Sharma as Enquiry Officer and the Inquiry Officer has fixed date and venue of inquiry proceedings on 1-7-2020 *vide* communication dated 27-6-2020 but he did not come on the fixed date, time and venue. Thereafter respondent no.2 written a letter on 9th July, 2020 to the petitioner wherein respondent asked the petitioner to submit formal resignation not later than 15-7-2020 and if company do not receive any formal resignation letter before 17-7-2020 consider this letter as letter of termination *w.e.f.* 18-7-2020. It is alleged that termination of the services of petitioner *w.e.f.* 18-7-2020 by respondent no.2 was illegal and unjustified. It is asserted that before passing termination order dated 9-7-2020 Annexure P-21 no inquiry was held to prove the alleged charges against the petitioner. No opportunity of defense and personal hearing was provided/afforded to the petitioner and as such the action of respondent terminating the service of petitioner was against the principles of natural justice, illegal, unjustified and is in violation of the provisions of Model Standing Orders and Articles 14 & 16 of the Constitution of India. It is alleged that respondent management had not adhered to procedure as laid down in the Model Standing Orders made by the State Government of Himachal Pradesh under the Industrial

Employment (Standing Orders) Act, 1946 prior to termination of the services of the petitioner. It is asserted that the petitioner had more than four years spotless continuous service with the respondent and there is settled law that illegal termination of service amounts to retrenchment and management had to comply with the provisions of Section 25 Clause F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 however in the present case the respondent had neither served one month's notice in writing to the petitioner as well as appropriate authority nor paid one month wages in lieu of notice period to the petitioner. No retrenchment compensation was paid to the petitioner on the last working day. No notice in prescribed manner was served upon the appropriate government as well as no prior approval was obtained from the competent/appropriate authority and as such the action of the respondent management regarding termination of the services of petitioner was illegal and clear cut violation of Section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. It is alleged that after terminating the services of petitioner respondent had engaged Mr. Ashok Kumar s/o Shri Hukam Chand as Granulation Operation but no opportunity of re-employment was ever provided to the petitioner and action of respondents clearly violated the provisions of Section 25 Clause H of the Industrial Disputes Act. It is prayed that illegal order of termination dated 9.7.2020 passed by the respondents may be quashed and set aside and respondents may be directed to reinstate the services of petitioner *w.e.f.* 18-7-2020 *i.e.* from the date of his illegal termination along-with back wages, seniority and continuity of service as well as pay 10% compound interest on the amount of back wages being equitable relief as petitioner was remained unemployed since the date of his illegal termination.

3. In reply to the claim petition filed on behalf of respondents no. 1 and 2 preliminary objections qua maintainability and estopple have been raised. On merits, it is admitted that petitioner had joined Tidal Laboratories Pvt. Ltd. in December, 2015 and his services were terminated *w.e.f.* 18-7-2020 however termination of the petitioner was not illegal but the same was done after compliance of due process and provided due opportunity being heard. Moreover due to unauthorized absence and for instigated other workmen and obstructing other workmen from doing the duty etc. the petitioner remained under suspension. It is alleged that there were no genuine demands of the workmen. It is asserted that respondent company had providing all basic amenities and facilities in accordance with framework of law. It is submitted that the matter with regard to employees' demands was negotiated and both the parties i.e. workers and management had resolved the same amicably. '*The workers and the company (Tidal Laboratories Pvt. Ltd.) have signed memorandum of settlement under Section18 (1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 on 02-07-2020'.* It is alleged that the respondents management had never violated any provisions of EPF Act. It is again submitted that settlement was arrived on 2-7-2020 and the workers and the factory management were working together happily. It is submitted that all the allegations made were false and concocted. On 1-12-2015 the petitioner was appointed at factory address of respondent company as a Granulation Operator and had continued his services till 17-7-2020 and he was drawing wages of Rs. 14,500/- per month along-with other incentives as per company policy. It is asserted that due to Covid-19 the respondent company was temporarily closed. It is asserted that in lieu of emergency situation respondent company resumed its activities at the factory after obtaining all necessary permission and followed MHA and District Administration Standard Operating Procedure/guidelines. On 6-5-2020 the petitioner was telephonically notified by respondent company being a local resident to resume his official duties. It was also informed to him that necessary permission for his daily travel required were obtained and the same was given to him however petitioner had resumed his duties on 8-5-2020 and attended till 10-5-2020. It is asserted that petitioner was continuously absent since 11.5.2020 without any reasonable explanation or authorization from the respondent company however he was time and again reminded of necessity of having requested workmen at the factory premises as the respondent company could not be operated with full workforce and it was necessary that the work force who were the local residents to present the factory premises for smooth functioning of factory operations. On 16-5-2020 after repeated requests finally a show cause notice was sent by the

respondent company to petitioner for his unauthorized absence. It is asserted that petitioner had not heeded the requests of respondent company however all of sudden started anti-establishment activity and tried to influence the workforce not to join duties but other workers had not joined his call. It is asserted that petitioner adopted means of tarnishing the reputation of the directors and goodwill of the company by spreading false remarks which inter alia included the respondent company doing atrocities on the labourers and compelled them to come to the company. It is alleged that petitioner had instigated other workers and filed complaint against respondent company on 18-5-2020 which was signed by few workers as well as petitioner. It is asserted that due to misbehave in instigating other workmen to file a complaint against the company a suspension letter dated 19-5-2020 was sent to the petitioner. However assuming quarantine to be true the petitioner had visited the factory premises on 8-5-2020 and 9-5-2020 which had endangered all other factory workers. On 25-5-2020 the respondent company had filed a charge-sheet against the petitioner for his misbehaviour and anti-establishment activities wherein it is stated that petitioner was wilfully absented from his duties at factory without any reason and authorization. It is alleged that petitioner had filed a false complaint against the respondent company with false allegations and due to which the petitioner was served a letter for suspension of services until further investigation which was refused to be accepted. It is asserted that respondent company after given repeated opportunities to petitioner and finding his replies to be unsatisfactory on 30-5-2020 sent a letter to petitioner regarding appointment of Mr. P.K. Sharma as inquiry officer and all the correspondence to be made by him. It is asserted that in spite of repeated requests petitioner had not given any reasonable explanation for his behaviour. It is alleged that petitioner made a goal to destroy the reputation of the directors and goodwill of respondent company. When all attempts failed the petitioner had started protest outside the premises of the factory of the respondent company on 20-6-2020. It is asserted that principles of natural justice and standing orders and articles 14 and 16 of Indian Constitution were complied with as well as respondent management adhered to procedure as laid down before passing the termination order and no illegality or violation of the Act was made while terminating the petitioner. It is asserted that the provisions of Section 25 Clause F, H and Section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act were not applicable to petitioner in the present case. Other parawise averments made in the claim petition are denied and it is prayed that services of petitioner were terminated in accordance with law as well as adhered the provisions of principles of natural justice. It is therefore prayed that the petition of the petitioner deserves to be dismissed.

4. In rejoinder to the reply filed on behalf of respondents preliminary objections were denied facts stated in the petition are reasserted and reaffirmed.

5. On the basis of the pleadings of the parties, the following issues were framed for adjudication and determination:-

1. Whether the services of the petitioner were illegally terminated by the respondents without complying with the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, as alleged? ..*OPP.*

2. If issue No.1 is proved in affirmative, whether the petitioner is entitled to back wages, seniority, compensation and past service benefits as claimed? ..*OPP.*

3. Whether the petition is not maintainable, as alleged? ..*OPR.*

4. Whether the petitioner is estopped by his act and conduct to file the claim, as alleged? ..*OPR.*

5. Relief.

6. The petitioner in order to prove his case has examined himself as PW1 and produced on record his affidavit Ext. PW1/A. He also produced on record documents *i.e.* copy of letter dated

9-7-2020 Ext. PW1/B, copy of election notification Ext. PW1/C, copy of demand notice dated 25-3-2019 Ext. PW1/D, copy of reference dated 13-5-2020 Ext. PW1/E, copy of summon Ext. PW1/F, copy of daily order dated 6-2-2020 Ext. PW1/G, copy of daily order dated 2-6-2021 Ext. PW1/H, copy of complaint dated 24-10-2019 Ext. PW1/J, copy of demand notice dated 6-11-2019 Ext. PW1/K, copy of letter dated 12-12-2019 Ext. PW1/L, copy of certificate dated 18-5-2020 Ext. PW1/M, copy of certificate dated 20.5.2020 Ext. PW1/N, copy of representation dated 18-5-2020 Ext.PW1/O, copy of letter dated 19-5-2020 Ext. PW1/P, copy of reply dated 19-5-2020 Ext. PW1/Q, copy of reply dated 20-5-2020 Ext. PW1/R, copy of letter dated 25-5-2020 Ext. PW1/S, copy of reply dated 26-5-2020 Ext. PW1/T, copy of letter dated 27-5-2020 Ext. PW1/U, copy of reply dated 29-5-2020 Ext. PW1/V, copy of letter dated 30-5-2020 Ext. PW1/W, copy of letter dated 27-6-2020 Ext. PW1/X, copy of letter dated 15-7-2020 Ext. PW1/Y, copy of demand notice dated 9-9-2020 Ext. PW1/Z, copy of letter dated 31-5-2024 Ext. P-1, copy of report dated 27-4-2022 Ext. P-2 and copy of order dated 4-3-2020 Ext. P-3. The petitioner has also examined Shri Bhag Singh s/o Shri Tilak Ram by way of affidavit Ext. PW2/A and copy of letter dated 28-6-2020 Ext. PW2/B.

7. Respondent on the other hand has examined Shri Sanjeev Kumar, Authorized Representative of respondent as RW1 by way of affidavit Ext. RW1/A wherein he has reiterated the facts as stated in the reply. He has also produced on record documents *i.e.* copy of authority letter Ext. R1A, copy of letter to Rampal dated 15-5-2020 Ext. R2A, copy of apology letter Ext. R3A, copy of letter of Rampal Ext. R4A, copy of letter dated 16-5-2020 to Vicky Ram Ext. R5A, copy of apology letter of Vicky Ram Ext. R6A, copy of letter dated 16-5-2020 to Vijay Kumar Ext. R7A, copy of apology letter of Vijay Kumar Ext. R8A, copy of letter dated 16-5-2020 to Raghuvir Singh Ext. R9A, copy of apology letter of Raghuvir Singh Ext. R10A, copy of letter dated 16-5-2020 to Mukhtiyar Singh Ext. R11A, copy of apology letter of Mukhtiyar Singh Ext. R12A, copy of letter dated 16-5-2020 to Gagandeep Singh Ext. R13A, copy of apology letter of Gagandeep Singh Ext. R14A, copy of letter dated 16-5-2020 to Anita Rani Ext. R15A, copy of apology letter of Anita Rani Ext. R16, copy of Board resolution Ex. R17, copy of certificate of incorporation Ext. R18, copy of letter dated 23-11-2025 Ext. R19, copy of letter dated 19-5.2-2020 Ext. R20, copy of notice dated 4-6-2020 Ext. R21, copy of letter to DSP dated 8-6-2020 Ext. R22, copy of letter dated 11-6-2020 to Dy. Labour Commissioner Ext. R23, copy of letter dated 9-7-2020 Ext. R24, copy of full and final statement Ext. R25.

8. I have heard the learned Counsel for both the parties at length and records perused.

9. For the reasons to be recorded hereinafter while discussing the issues for determination, my findings thereon are as under:

| | |
|---|---|
| Issue No. 1 | : Yes |
| Issue No. 2 | : Decided accordingly |
| Issue No. 3 | : No |
| Issue No. 4 | : No |
| Relief. | : Claim petition is partly allowed per operative portion of the Award. |

**REASONS FOR FINDINGS**

**Issue No. 1**

10. It is not disputed fact that petitioner was working with respondents factory since 1-1-2015 upto 18-7-2020. The petitioner had described set of circumstances which according to him existed prior to his illegal termination on 18-7-2020. The petitioner was branch senior Vice President of Himachal Pradesh Industrial Workers Union registration no. 155, HO Saproon Solan

H.P. Branch Tidal Laboratory Pvt. Ltd. Workers Union Golthai. This union was formed for redressal of certain demands of workmen. Shri Vikram Singh was the Branch President and Shri Virender Singh was Secretary of the aforesaid union. The Branch Committee of the union served a demand notice under Section 2K of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 upon the respondents on 25-3-2019 raising certain demands sent to Labour Officer-*cum*-Conciliation Officer Bilaspur. Conciliation proceedings thereafter commenced with no amicable solution and failure report was sent to the Labour Commissioner, H.P. on 6-11-2019 and necessary reference was issued to Labour Court. The petitioner has also alleged that on the complaint of union and the petitioner certain irregularities and violation of payment of wages by the respondent was found which led registration of case 14/2020 and 15/2020 before Judicial Magistrate Bilaspur.

11. The petitioner has further alleged that union had made a compliant to Regional Provident Fund Commissioner for the violation of EPF Act, 1952 on which inquiry was initiated against the company. Petitioner had also made complaint to the Chief Minister of Himachal Pradesh regarding non payment of wages and overtime etc. In the light of these circumstances the petitioner has alleged that respondents became vindictive against him. Petitioner also submitted another complaint made by union qua illegal termination of contractual workers vide demand notice dated 6-11-2019. In order to support his contention the petitioner has also examined PW2 Shri Bhag Singh. In his affidavit this witness has also submitted that he was elected as Advisor, District Council of All India Trade Union Congress District Bilaspur-cum-Secretary H.P State Council of Himachal Pradesh of All India Trade Union Congress. H.P Industrial Workers Union with registration No. 155 HO Saproon Solan Branch of Tidal Laboratory Pvt. Ltd. Workers union Golthai is affiliated to All India Trade Union Congress regarding which petitioner workman Shri Pradeep Kumar is the elected Branch Senior Vice President and Vikram Singh is the elected Branch Secretary of the Union. He also stated about demand notice dated 25-3-2019 served on the respondents. He however submitted that on 19-5-2020 the services of petitioner Pradeep Kumar were placed under suspension by the respondents management on false and fabricated charges and in an illegal manner. Respondent no. 2 has appointed Shri P.K Sharma as inquiry officer who fixed venue of the enquiry on 1st July, 2020 at 1.30 PM in the premises of respondents factory. On receipt letter Ext. PW1/X the petitioner workman had appointed Shri Bhag Singh as his defense assistant to assist him in the inquiry proceedings. He however alleges that on 1.7.2020 he along-with petitioner Pradeep Kumar went to said scheduled venue on the date and time fixed by the Inquiry Officer. They reached the respondents factory at 10 AM and waited at factory entrance gate from 10 AM to 4PM however Shri P.K. Sharma, Inquiry Officer did not come to the factory premises nor any intimation was given to the petitioner workman. On inquiry the petitioner was told that Shri P.K. Sharma had not come and the next date would be intimated to them. He has admitted that they had not reported the fact regarding the absence of inquiry officer before conciliation officer. He denied that the petitioner and the defense assistant did not appear before inquiry officer on the different dates which were fixed for the purpose of hearing.

12. The respondents have denied all the allegations qua violation of labour laws. The factum of dispute between the workman and respondents company are not expressly denied. It is however asserted that the workman and the company have signed a memorandum of settlement under Section 18 Clause 1 of the Industrial Disputes Act. The allegations of vindictive attitude repressive measures including threats given to the petitioner have also been denied. The respondents by way of their witness RW1 Shri Sanjeev Kumar have alleged that on 21-3-2020 due to covid situation there was nationwide lockdown. The respondents resumed the activities being drug manufacturing company. The petitioner was notified telephonically to resume its duty from 6-5-2020. He resume the duty only on 8-5-2020 and then without any reasonable explanation remained absent on 11-5-2020 onwards. On 16-5-2020 the company sent a show cause notice for unauthorized absence of petitioner. It is alleged that petitioner on 18-5-2020 instigated the workmen made a false complaint that factory premises of the respondent company was unclean and

unsanitary. These allegations were clarified by the company before authorities. On 18-5-2020 company received a letter from Gram Panchayat advising the petitioner to remain in quarantine as per covid protocol from 4-5-2020 for 14 days. This meant that petitioner has resumed their duties on the earlier date *i.e.* 8-5-2020 and 9-5-2020 against covid protocol. Thus on 19-5-2020 suspension letter was issued to the petitioner. Respondents have alleged that act of petitioner was the violation of Disaster Management Act under Section 188 of Indian Penal Code. The fact regarding joining of duty by the petitioner on 8-5-2020 and 9-5-2020 was subsequently explained by the Gram Panchayat are not denied. In-fact according to petitioner he went to attend funeral of his aunt on 4-5-2020 on the basis of pass issued by authorities. After receiving directions of Gram Panchayat he followed advise to remain in quarantine.

13. On 25-5-2020 respondents company had issued a charge-sheet against the petitioner for misbehaviour anti establishment activity, absence and for visiting the factory premises on 8-5-2020 and 9-5-2020. It is alleged that from 2-6-2020 to 8-6-2020 petitioner carried out anti establishment activities and instigated other workers working in the factory and filed a written complaint against the company. The reply of the petitioner to the charge-sheet dated 26-5-2020 was found to be unsatisfactory by the respondent company. After giving repeated opportunity to the petitioner and finding his reply unsatisfactory on 30.-5-2020 a letter was sent to inform him that Shri P.K. Sharma has been appointed as Inquiry Officer. The inquiry officer informed the petitioner that on 1-7-2020 inquiry would be conducted and on 1-7-2020 verbal proceedings were carried out. The petitioner failed to show up and proceedings were postponed to 6-7-2020. This hearing also was not attended by petitioner. On 9-7-2020 final day of proceedings the petitioner failed to appear and the Inquiry Officer concluded the charge-sheet against the petitioner as proved and correct. On 15-7-2020 a letter of option to resign and alternatively the termination of the petitioner *w.e.f.* 18-7-2020 has been established. Shri Sanjeev Kumar RW1 has produced all the documents with regard to the alleged inquiry and other documents regarding the various communications with the petitioner.

14. Petitioner in his cross-examination has denied that he had failed to appear before inquiry officer on the informed date and also stated that one employee Sanjeev Kumar had told him and the defense counsel that the inquiry Officer had not come to the factory premises on the date fixed for hearing *i.e.* 1-7-2020. PW2 Shri Bhag Singh has also corroborated the above version of the petitioner.

15. RW1 Shri Sanjeev Kumar has asserted that the termination of the petitioner was consequent to inquiry proceedings. He states that inquiry officer had informed the worker about the dates which have been fixed for hearing. He however admitted that no such notice has been produced on record by the respondents. He admitted that no witness was examined from the company during the inquiry proceedings and no exparte order was passed. He admits that termination order does not mention the inquiry proceedings and/or that the termination was consequence to the charges proved in an inquiry.

16. Admittedly, petitioner had not been paid any retrenchment compensation or pay in lieu of notice of his disengagement as per the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. RW1 Shri Sanjeev Kumar has also admitted in his cross-examination that at the time of termination of the petitioner no permission was sought from this court or from the appropriate government. He also admitted that neither one month's notice or pay in lieu of notice was given to the petitioner. It is rightly argued by learned Authorized Representative for the petitioner that once respondents are alleging the termination of the petitioner consequent to the inquiry proceedings the examination of the Inquiry Officer was mandatory in this case. The inquiry officer has not been examined by the respondents. The so-called verbal inquiry is not proved to have been conducted as per law and no witnesses were examined at the time of conduct of inquiry. In absence of examination of witnesses

conclusion of guilt against the petitioner by the inquiry officer is clearly not admissible. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in **State of Uttar Pradesh vs. Saroj Kumar Sinha, (2010) 2 SCC 772** has held in paras no. 27, 28 and 30 as follows:-

> "**27**. A bare perusal of the aforesaid sub-rule shows that when the respondent had failed to submit the explanation to the charge-sheet it was incumbent upon the inquiry officer to fix a date for his appearance in the inquiry. It is only in a case when the government servant despite notice of the date fixed failed to appear that the inquiry officer can proceed with the inquiry ex parte. Even in such circumstances it is incumbent on the inquiry officer to record the statement of witnesses mentioned in the charge-sheet. Since the government servant is absent, he would clearly lose the benefit of cross-examination of the witnesses. But nonetheless in order to establish the charges the Department is required to produce the necessary evidence before the inquiry officer. This is so as to avoid the charge that the inquiry officer has acted as a prosecutor as well as a judge.
>
> **28**. An inquiry officer acting in a quasi-judicial authority is in the position of an independent adjudicator. He is not supposed to be a representative of the department/disciplinary authority/Government. His function is to examine the evidence presented by the Department, even in the absence of the delinquent official to see as to whether the unrebutted evidence is sufficient to hold that the charges are proved. In the present case the aforesaid procedure has not been observed. Since no oral evidence has been examined the documents have not been proved, and could not have been taken into consideration to conclude that the charges have been proved against the respondents.
>
> **30**. When a departmental enquiry is conducted against the government servant it cannot be treated as a casual exercise. The enquiry proceedings also cannot be conducted with a closed mind. The inquiry officer has to be wholly unbiased. The rules of natural justice are required to be observed to ensure not only that justice is done but is manifestly seen to be done. The object of rules of natural justice is to ensure that a government servant is treated fairly in proceedings which may culminate in imposition of punishment including dismissal/removal from service."

17. There is no document produced by the respondents to show that petitioner was duly notified to appear at the time of conduct of the alleged inquiry. No witnesses have been examined by inquiry officer while coming to the conclusion regarding guilt of the accused, thus contention of the respondents regarding an inquiry is farce and afterthought. The allegations made in the charge-sheet were not proved by examination of witness hence the inquiry as well as conclusion regarding termination of the services of petitioner was illegal. There was no compliance of the provisions of Sections 25 Clause F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 hence issue no.1 is decided in the favour of petitioner and against the respondents.

**Issue No. 2**

18. It has been proved from the overwhelming evidence that the services of the petitioner were illegally terminated by the respondents without any compliance of the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. The petitioner in this case has claimed the back wages, seniority as well as compensation with regard to illegal termination. The overall circumstances of the case clearly show that the respondents have concluded the guilt of accused with a clear motive to dispense with his services without complying with the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. In these circumstances the petitioner is held entitled to reinstatement to the similar post from

the date of his termination along-with seniority, 50% of back wages and a compensation of Rs.1 lakh. Hence issue no. 2 is decided accordingly.

**Issues No.3 and 4**

19. The onus of proving these issues was on the respondents. The maintainability of the claim petition has been challenged on the ground that the termination of petitioner was after following due process an inquiry. However the facts contrary to these assertions have emerged from the evidence on the record. No such notice could be proved by the respondents which would lead this court to believe that petitioner is estopped from filing the claim by his act and conduct. Hence issues no. 3 and 4 are decided in the favour of the petitioner and against the respondents.

**RELIEF**

20. In view of my discussion on the issues no. 1 to 4 above, the claim petition succeeds and is partly allowed. The petitioner is held entitled to reinstatement to the similar post from the date of his termination along-with seniority, 50% of back wages and compensation of Rs.1 lakh. Parties are left to bear their costs.

21. The reference is answered in aforesaid terms. A copy of this Award be sent to the appropriate Government for publication in the official gazette. File after due completion be consigned to the Record Room.

Announced in the open Court today, this 26th day of February, 2026.

Sd/-
(PARVEEN CHAUHAN),
*Presiding Judge,*
*Labour Court*-cum-*Industrial Tribunal,*
*Kangra at Dharamshala (H.P.).*

---

**IN THE COURT OF PARVEEN CHAUHAN, PRESIDING JUDGE, LABOUR COURT-CUM-INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, KANGRA AT DHARAMSHALA (H.P.)**

Reference No. : 92/2023
Date of Institution : 03-11-2023
Date of Decision : 26-2-2026

Shri Narinder Kumar s/o Shri Kanshi Ram, r/o VPO Tikkar Khatrian, Tehsil Bhoranj, District Hamirpur, H.P. ..*Petitioner.*

*Versus*

The Divisional Forest Officer , Joginder Nagar Forest Division, Joginder Nagar, District Mandi, H.P. ..*Respondent.*

**Reference under Section 10 (1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947**

For the Petitioner : Sh. N.L. Kaundal, Ld. AR
: Sh. Vijay Kaundal, Ld. Adv.
For Respondent : Sh. B.C. Katoch, Ld. Dy. D.A.

**AWARD**

The following industrial disputes has been received by this court for the purpose of adjudication from the appropriate authority/Deputy Labour Commissioner:—

"Whether the demand raised by Shri Narinder Kumar s/o Shri Kanshi Ram, r/o V.P.O. Tikkar Khatrian, Tehsil Bhoranj, District Hamirpur, H.P. who is presently working on bill basis, to engage his services on muster roll basis and not to engage his services on bill basis before the Divisional Forest Officer, Joginder Nagar Forest Division, Joginder Nagar, District Mandi, H.P., is maintainable, legal and justified? If yes, from which date what relief of past service benefits the above workman is entitled to from the above employer. If not what its legal effect?"

2. The brief facts as stated in the claim petition are that the services of petitioner were initially engaged/appointed by the Divisional Forest Officer Joginder Nagar on muster roll basis *w.e.f.* 3-3-2003 and engaged in the office of Range Officer, Kamlah and he (petitioner) has continuously worked in the said capacity with fictional breaks till December, 2003. It is alleged that department had given fictional breaks to the petitioner from January, 2004 to March, 2004 and thereafter his services were again engaged by the department in Nursery Section at Kamlah Range Office *w.e.f.* 1-4-2004 in the same capacity and continuously worked on muster roll till September, 2006. It is alleged that the services condition of petitioner was unlawfully changed by the department without prior notice during the year 2006 on bill basis however in the months of November, 2007 to April, 2008 the petitioner was again provided muster roll by the respondent and thereafter he was engaged by the department on bill basis in month of January, 2009 and the department disengaged the services of petitioner in the month of February and March, 2009. It is asserted that thereafter the services of petitioner were engaged on bill basis and such practices continued till date. It is asserted that no terms and conditions were settled by the department at the time of engaging the petitioner on bill basis however petitioner had worked on daily wage basis in Kamlah Nursery and the department had shown the working of petitioner on bill basis only. It is asserted that in the seniority lists as stood on 31-12-2012 and 30-11-2016 the petitioner was figured at serial nos. 23 and 24. The petitioner had raised industrial dispute against respondent *vide* demand notice dated 13-6-2022 wherein the petitioner has pleaded that his service conditions were changed by the respondent from muster roll to bill basis without serving him prior notice as mandatorily required under Section 9-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. It is alleged that the service conditions of the petitioner were changed just to deprive him of continuous service on muster roll for the purpose of regularization as per policy of the State Government. It is alleged that the act of department was unfair labour practice with regard to engaging and disengaging the services of petitioner time and again from June, 2004 to September, 2007 and engagement on bill basis was highly unjustified, arbitrary, unconstitutional and against the Item no. 10 of 5th Schedule to deprive him of the benefits of regularization. It is alleged that the department had also violated Articles 14, 16 and 21 of Constitution of India. It is therefore, prayed that in view of submissions made the court may allow the claim petition of petitioner. It is prayed to set aside illegal breaks period from time to time as well as set aside period of bill basis and respondent may be directed to engage the services of petitioner on muster roll instead of bill basis and period from June, 2004 onwards may be counted for the purpose of continuous service including regularization.

3. In reply to the claim petition preliminary objections qua maintainability, suppression of material facts and estopple have been raised. On merits, it is asserted that petitioner was initially engaged as casual labourer in Forest Department during June, 2004 on seasonal forestry works keeping in view availability of work and funds and not *w.e.f.* February, 2004 as forest worker, mali as alleged. It is asserted that works carried out by the forest department including plantation works, fire protection works and soil conservation works were seasonal as well as site specific. It is asserted that department depends upon and employs labourer on the basis of seasonal requirement.

It is asserted that the requirement was also based upon financial allocation to the works to be carried out in a year. It is asserted that daily waged workers are not engaged against any regular vacancy as well as casual labourer are not engaged against regular post in the department. Since H.P. Forest Department is not a Work Charged Establishment and daily wagers are not engaged against regular establishment there is no regular budget provisions for their wages in the actual budget of the department. It is asserted that since the forestry works are of seasonal nature so daily wage labour is engaged by the department on the need basis, work and availability of funds and disengaged after completion of works or if funds get exhausted. It is asserted that the petitioner had worked intermittently as per availability of work and funds on seasonal forestry works on muster roll and bill basis. It is asserted that petitioner was hired for work by respondent department on bill basis in few months *i.e.* 2006, 2007 and 2008 and thereafter *w.e.f.* April 2009 upto the year 2014 and got payments for execution of various works. It is asserted that as per seniority list as stood on 30-11-2016 the name of the petitioner was shown at serial no.53 and his date of engagement was shown as 1-6-2004. It is alleged that the services of petitioner were not terminated from time to time by the respondent in order to prevent him from completing 240 days in each year. Since the petitioner was absented himself from the work at his own sweet will due to seasonal and site specific work which was subject to availability of funds and petitioner had never completed 240 days of work in any of the calendar year from the date of his initial engagement. It is asserted that petitioner had worked for many years without any objection and now filed instant petition with malafide intention to derive the benefit of regularization and he was sitting mum and not raised any objection. Other averments made in the petition were denied and it is prayed that the claim of the petitioner deserves to be dismissed.

4. In rejoinder to the reply filed on behalf of respondents preliminary objections were denied facts stated in the petition are reasserted and reaffirmed.

5. On the basis of the pleadings of the parties, the following issues were framed for adjudication and determination:-

1. Whether the demand raised by the petitioner before the respondent with regard to his service is/was illegal and justified? (as amended) ..*OPP.*

2. If issue No.1 is proved in affirmative to what relief of past service benefits the petitioner is entitled to from the employer under the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, as claimed? ..OPP.

3. Whether the claim petition is not maintainable, as alleged? ..*OPR.*

4. Whether the petitioner has not come to the Court with clean hands and concealed the material facts, as alleged? ..*OPR.*

5. Whether the petitioner is estopped by his act and conduct and acquiescence to file the present claim petition? ..*OPR.*

Relief.

6. The petitioner in order to prove his case has examined himself as PW1 and produced on record his affidavit Ext. PW1/A. He has also produced on record the documents *i.e.* copy of seniority list Ext. PW1/B, copy of demand notice Ext. PW1/C, copy of mandays chart of petitioner Ext. PW1/D and copy of award Ext. PW1/E.

7. Respondent on the other hand has examined Shri Ashwani Kumar, HPFS, Divisional Forest Officer, Joginder Nagar Forest Division, District Mandi as RW1 by way of affidavit Ext.

RW1/A and also produced on record the documents *i.e.* copy of muster roll and bill chart of petitioner Ext. RW1/B, copy of muster rolls 31.5.2024 Ext. RW1/C to Ext. RW1/Z1, copies of bills Ext. RW1/Z2 to Ext. RW1/Z101 and copy of seniority list Ext. RW1/Z102.

8. I have heard the learned Authorized Representative/Counsel for the petitioner as well as learned Dy. D.A. for the respondent at length and records perused.

9. For the reasons to be recorded hereinafter while discussing the issues for determination, my findings thereon are as under:

| | |
|---|---|
| Issue No. 1 | : Partly Yes |
| Issue No. 2 | : Decided accordingly |
| Issue No. 3 | : No |
| Issue No. 4 | : No |
| Issue No. 5 | : No |
| Relief. | : Claim petition is partly allowed per operative portion of the Award. |

## REASONS FOR FINDINGS

**Issue No. 1**

10. The petitioner's claim is that he was appointed as daily wage worker by the respondent on muster roll basis in Kamlah Range from 2003 till 2009. During this period he was given breaks in service not allowing him to complete 240 days and the department had without notice changed his working condition from muster roll to bill basis and vice versa. The juniors of the petitioner were provided work regularly.

11. The respondent has contested this claim of the petitioner and asserted that he was a casual labourer in forest department during 2004 on seasonal forestry works. It is asserted that the work carried out by department are plantation, fire protection and soil moisture conservation works which are seasonal in nature. Thus the department employed the workers on the basis of seasonal requirement and on the basis of financial allocations regarding the work to be carried out in a year. Daily wages workers are not engaged against any vacancy or regular post and there is no regular budget provision for their service. It is further asserted that whenever need arises labour is engaged on daily on monthly basis. The labour is disengaged after completion of work if funds are exhausted. The petitioner also worked intermittently as per the availability of work.

12. RW1 Shri Ashwani Kumar, Divisional Forest Officer has admitted in his cross-examination that as per Ext. PW1/B the petitioner is shown to be appointed on 3.3.2003. On one hand he alleges that petitioner was engaged as casual labourer, on the other hand he admits that petitioner was paid on daily wage basis. He denied that fictional breaks were given to the petitioner and that petitioner was called for work as and when work was available. No records of any communication vide which the petitioner was called for duty is however produced on record. He admits that no notice under Section 9A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 was issued to the petitioner when his services were changed from daily wages basis to bill basis. No quotation of the work given by the petitioner has also been produced. It is admitted that no quotation was ever given by the petitioner. It is also admitted that department does not advertise the work calling for quotation from interested persons. It is admitted that bills Ext. RW1/Z2 to Ext. RW1/Z101 are prepared by the department officials. He admits that regular workers are performing throughout the year and there is no notification of the government declaring the forest department as seasonal

industry. It is further admitted by him that no guidelines have been issued by the State Government to get the work done on bill basis.

13. The above evidence and specifically Ext. RW1/B shows that the petitioner has performed the work of department since 6/2004 to 9/2006 on muster roll basis. It appears that during these period he had completed 240 days of regular work in the 12 preceding months. During 6/2006, 8/2006 and 12/2008 he was made to work on bill basis. He worked on bill basis till 9/2007 and again from 11/2007 to 4/2008 on muster roll basis. From 6/2008 to 11/2008 on bill basis and from 1-2-2009 on muster roll basis. After the year 2009 he was continuously engaged on bill basis only. Learned Dy. D.A. for the respondent has argued that record of payment made to the petitioner shows huge payment which clearly and manifestly established that petitioner had worked on bill basis voluntarily and was not working on daily wage basis with a view to gain higher amount. This also shows that petitioner left the work at his own will.

14. Arguments to the contrary are raised by the Learned Authorized Representative/Counsel for the petitioner and it is submitted that department has deliberately changed service condition of petitioner from muster roll basis to bill basis without any due notice as required under the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act. He also alleged that department has failed to provide regular work to the petitioner despite availability of work and funds. He argues that if the department was ready to pay huge amount as daily wages there was no dearth of funds with the department. The engagement of petitioner on bill basis after a long period of daily wage work was merely to deprive him from all the benefits of continuous service as per policy of the government based on length of continuous service.

15. The peculiar circumstances of this case clearly shows that petitioner was working on muster roll basis in the year 2004 and alternatively engaged on muster roll and bill basis till 2009. After 2009 the petitioner was shown to have been continuously worked with the department on daily basis. The careful perusal of document Ext. RW1/B shows the payment is being made to the petitioner after a gap of every two or three months. This shows that petitioner was continuously working with the respondent department in each year upto 2024. The contention of the department that work was done only seasonally and as per availability of work and grant of funds is not tenable as the work is shown to have been done by the petitioner almost continuously in each year upto 2024. Department deliberately failed to keep the record of the mandays of the petitioner with a view to deprive him the benefits of continuous service. The employment on bill basis not proved on the basis of the policy of the government and there is no quotation given by the petitioner which vindicates his stand that he was appointed on muster roll basis only. The respondent department has violated the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act as they appointed petitioner for long period of time shown to have been paid on bill basis only. This is a violation of entry no.10 of Vth Schedule of the Industrial Disputes Act,1947 as well as the basic fundamental rights of the petitioner. It has been admitted by the respondent witness that regular workers are also working with the department. No notice has ever been issued to the petitioner by the department regarding the change of his service condition. The Hon'ble High Court of H.P. in **Ram Singh vs. State of Himachal Pradesh and others in CWP No. 789 of 2024, decided on 4.7.2024** has observed in para nos. 5 and 6 as follows:-

> "5. It is not in dispute that the petitioner is serving with the respondents-Department since 2015 continuously by putting in more than 240 days in each calendar. It appears that in order to deny such kind of workmen, the benefits of regularization, respondent-State has come with the nomenclature of "bill basis" but, fact of the matter still remains that be it a daily wager or a bill basis worker, he is serving the Department regularly putting in more than 240 days in each calendar.

6. This Court of the considered view that the distinction, which is now being created by the respondents- Department between a daily wage worker and a bill base worker is violative of Article 14 of the Constitution of India. Be it a daily wage worker or a bill base worker, he is rendering the same service to the Department. Therefore, in the absence of their being any intelligible differentia between a daily wage worker and bill base worker, the classification that has been made by the Department cannot pass the touch stone of Article 14 of the Constitution of India".

16. Similarly the Hon'ble High Court of H.P. in **Billu Ram vs. State of H.P. and Ors., CWP No. 7024 of 2024** has held in paras no. 6,7 and 8 as follows:—

"6.As per reply, the mandays chart enclosed with the petition had been prepared wrongly as the work was executed by the petitioner on the basis of schedule of rates and not as per labour rates. The petitioner had worked on bill basis intermittently in Sarahan, Bahli and Rampur Ranges. There was no mention of days in the bills. According to the respondents, the petitioner had worked on bill basis and was not a daily wager of the respondent-Department, hence, his claim for regularization of service is not tenable.

7. In *Pyare Lal Vs. State of H.P. & Ors.*, respondents' contention for denying regularization to the petitioner therein, on the ground of his engagement being on bill basis was turned down. Engagement on bill basis was held to be not a determinative factor. Respondents were directed to consider the case of the petitioner, therein, for regularization in terms of the State policy after taking into consideration the period for which the petitioner therein had worked with the respondents irrespective of the manner in which he was paid. Relevant paras from the decision are as under: -

*"6. In the case in hand, the respondents have submitted that the petitioner has not worked for 240 days in any calendar year. They have not submitted the mandays chart, showing the engagement of the petitioner per year since 2010. The only material placed on record is the details provided in Annexure R-3, which leads to no conclusion, as from this document, it cannot be inferred that for how many days, the petitioner has worked in a particular year.*

*7. As regards the contention of the respondents that the petitioner has been engaged on bill basis will not be the determining factor. In Vikram Singh vs. State of H.P. & others, CWPOA No. 6748 of 2019, decided on 22-7-2022, this Court had examined the implication of payment of hourly basis to a workman vis-à-vis his entitlement for regularization on the basis of his continuous service as daily wager. It has been held that the relevance would be attached to the total working period irrespective of the manner in which the payment was made by the employer.*

*8. In light of above discussion, the petition is allowed with direction to the respondents to consider the case of the petitioner for regularization in terms of the policy of the State Government by taking into consideration the entire period after January, 2010 for which the petitioner has worked with the respondents irrespective of the manner in which he was paid. The entire exercise in terms of this order including the passing of final order shall be completed by respondent No.3 within a period of two months from the date when a copy of this order is*

*submitted before such authority. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of."*

8. It is not in dispute that the respondents have implemented the above decision and considered the period of service rendered by the petitioner, therein, on bill basis, for the purpose of his claim for regularization of services. The claim was though rejected eventually on the ground that the petitioner, therein, was found to have not completed 240 days during the years in question".

17. The petitioner has worked with the department since the year 2004 upto 2009. This period has to be counted as period of continuous services as breaks which appear to have been given to petitioner by the respondent were not due to seasonal nature of work or deficiency of funds. The breaks which have been given to the petitioner in the work being done by him were deliberate hence period of breaks has to be counted for the purpose of regular service. It is proved from overwhelming evidence that the demand raised by the petitioner presently working on the bill basis to engage on muster roll basis is legal and justified. Issue no.1 is decided partly in the favour of the petitioner.

**Issue No. 2**

18. The careful perusal of evidence produced before the court shows that petitioner has started working with the respondent since the year 2004. He continued to work on bill basis and muster roll basis alternatively till 2009. After 2009 he is shown to have worked on bill basis. Bills are admittedly prepared by the department officials. Merely because the bills bear the signatures of the petitioner do not establish that he has not worked continuously with the department. In-fact demands made by the petitioner strengthen his contention regarding continuous work and it is established that there was no paucity of work and funds with the department. Thus period of breaks given to the petitioner by the respondent department are to be counted for the purpose of regular service. Respondent is directed to re-engage the petitioner on muster roll basis forthwith and consider the case of regularization of petitioner as per policy of the State. Hence issue no. 2 is decided accordingly.

**Issues No. 3, 4 and 5**

19. The onus of proving these issues was on the respondent. The respondent has continuously submitted that the petitioner was engaged on bill basis due to limited availability of work and funds. There is nothing on record to show that department had ever issued any notice to the petitioner regarding change of his service condition. There is no evidence to prove that there was non-availability of work and funds with the department. The department has failed to establish that the engagement of petitioner on bill basis was in accordance with the policy of breaks issued by the State. Thus the present claim is maintainable and the petitioner is not estopped by his act and conduct from filing the claim. Hence issues no. 3 to 5 are decided in the favour of the petitioner and against the respondent.

**RELIEF**

20. In view of my discussion on the issues no. 1 to 5 above, the claim petition succeeds and is partly allowed. The period of breaks given to the petitioner by the respondent department are to be counted for the purpose of regular service. Respondent is directed to re-engage the petitioner on muster roll basis forth with and consider the case of regularization of petitioner as per policy of the State. Parties are left to bear their costs.

21. The reference is answered in aforesaid terms. A copy of this Award be sent to the appropriate Government for publication in the official gazette. File after due completion be consigned to the Record Room.

Announced in the open Court today, this 26th day of February, 2026.

Sd/-
(PARVEEN CHAUHAN),
*Presiding Judge, Labour Court*-cum-*Industrial Tribunal,*
*Kangra at Dharamshala (H.P.).*

---

**IN THE COURT OF PARVEEN CHAUHAN, PRESIDING JUDGE, LABOUR COURT-CUM-INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, KANGRA AT DHARAMSHALA (H.P.)**

Reference No. : 08/2025
Date of Institution : 28-2-2025
Date of Decision : 26-2-2026

Smt. Bimla Devi w/o Shri Pyare La, r/o Village Halel, P.O. Kanaid, Tehsil Sunder Nagar, District Mandi, H.P. ..*Petitioner.*

*Versus*

1. The Director, Health Services Himachal Pradesh, Shimla.
2. The Chief Medical Officer, Mandi, District Mandi, H.P.
3. The Block Medical Officer, Rohanda, Tehsil Sunder Nagar, District Mandi, H.P.
4. The Medical Officer, Primary Health Centre Kanaid, Tehsil Sunder Nagar, District Mandi, H.P. ..*Respondents.*

**Reference under Section 10 (1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947**

For the Petitioner : Sh. N.L. Kaundal, Ld. AR
: Sh. Vijay Kaundal, Ld. Adv.
For Respondent(s) : Sh. Satish Thakur, Ld. Dy. D.A.

**AWARD**

The following industrial disputes has been received by this court for the purpose of adjudication from the appropriate authority/Deputy Labour Commissioner:—

"Whether the termination of services of Smt. Bimla Devi W/O Shri Pyare Lal, Village Halel, P.O. Kanaid, Tehsil Sunder Nagar, District Mandi, H.P. by (i) The Director, Health Services Himachal Pradesh, Shimla (ii) The Chief Medical Officer, Mandi, District Mandi, H.P. (iii) The Block Medical Officer, Rohanda, Tehsil Sunder Nagar, District Mandi, H.P., (iv) The Medical Officer, Primary Health Centre Kanaid, Tehsil Sunder Nagar, District Mandi, H.P., *w.e.f.* 01-09-2023 without complying with the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, is legal and justified? If not, what relief of reinstatement, back wages, seniority regularization, past service benefits and amount of compensation the above aggrieved workman is entitled to from the above employers?"

2. The brief facts as stated in the claim petition are that Health Department, Government of Himachal Pradesh filled up some vacancies on different posts against vacant post of regular/permanent employee whose services were retired by government after attaining superannuation. The respondent department required the application of candidates for the post of sweeper and petitioner submitted an application before Chief Medical Officer and then Block Medical Officer, Rohanda called the petitioner for interview. The interviews was conducted and petitioner selected was by the department thereafter she was appointed in the month of January, 2009 in the capacity of sweeper against sanctioned post. She was not however given any appointment letter and no terms and conditions were settled with her by the respondents. It is further submitted that from January, 2009 to 31-8-2023 the work and conduct of the petitioner was satisfactory and upto the mark as she never gave any chance to the respondents for any misconduct and did not receive show cause notice. Her services were satisfactory for the said period and she was getting the salary after a gap of 2 or 3 months as per minimum wages enhanced by the Government of Himachal Pradesh Finance Department time to time. It is alleged that services of petitioner were unlawfully terminated by the respondent no.4 the Medical Officer, Primary Health Centre Kanaid, Tehsil Sunder Nagar, District Mandi, H.P. It is asserted that petitioner completed more than 240 days of work in each and every calendar year from January, 2009 to 31-8-2023. She completed 240 days of work in 12 months immediately preceding her termination thus she was covered in the definition of continuous service under Section 25-B of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and Section 25-F Clause (b) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 was also applicable to the petitioner at the time of her termination. It is alleged that respondents have not served any show cause notice to the petitioner for any alleged misconduct nor any inquiry was conducted against her. After the termination of the petitioner respondents appointed new persons on services in her place on outsource basis thus petitioner was unlawfully terminated and deprived of her permanent status of regularization as per policy of the Government. It is alleged that the act and conduct of the respondent amounted to unfair labour practice against the mandatory provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. It is prayed that the termination order dated 1-8-2023 is liable to be quashed as it violates Articles 14, 16 and 21 of the Constitution. Petitioner has prayed that her illegal termination dated 31-7-2023 may be set aside and she be reinstated in her service along-with seniority in service and full back wages. She also prayed that the respondents be directed to pay different arrears of wages in favour of the petitioner after regularizing her services on completion of seven years of continuous service.

3. In reply to the claim petition preliminary objections qua maintainability, concealment of material facts etc. have been raised. It is asserted that petitioner was served with one month's notice before her termination and she was appointed by Rogi Kalyan Samiti and not by the replying respondents. On merits, it is admitted that petitioner was appointed as sweeper by Rogi Kalyan Samiti and she was directed to work at the rate remuneration payable at Rs.600/- month. All the payments were made to the petitioner by Rogi Kalyan Samiti and replying respondents had no concern with it. It is admitted that petitioner worked from April, 2012 till 31-8-2023. She was served one month's notice regarding termination of service as per directions of respondents no.1 and 2 by Secretary Health Government of Himachal Pradesh notification No.HFW-A(2)5/2019 dated 16-8-2021 Jan Arogya Samiti (JAS) was made to function and replaced Rogi Kalyan Samiti at PHC level. The CHC's/CH's are still governed by Rogi Kalyan Samiti guidelines. Respondents have submitted that there is no provisions of keeping part time worker in Primary Health Centre Khurahal. It is also submitted that there is no provisions of hiring manpower for carrying cleanliness/sanitation work at health institutions by Jan Arogya Samiti. Other averments made in the petition were denied and it is prayed that the claim of the petitioner deserves to be dismissed.

4. In rejoinder to the reply filed on behalf of respondents preliminary objections were denied facts stated in the petition are reasserted and reaffirmed.

5. On the basis of the pleadings of the parties, the following issues were framed for adjudication and determination:-

1. Whether the respondents have terminated the services of the petitioner *w.e.f.* 01-09-2023 without complying with the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 is illegal and unjustified, as alleged? ..*OPP.*

2. If issue No.1 is proved in affirmative, whether the petitioner is entitled to reinstatement, back wages, seniority, regularization, past service benefits and amount of compensation, as claimed? ..*OPP.*

3. Whether the claim petition is not maintainable, as alleged? ..*OPR.*

4. Whether the petitioner has concealed the material facts from the Court, as alleged? ..*OPR.*

5. Whether the claim petition is bad for non-joinder of the necessary party, as alleged? ..*OPR.*

Relief.

6. The petitioner in order to prove her case has examined herself as PW1 and produced on record her affidavit Ext. PW1/A wherein she has reiterated the facts stated in the claim petition. She has also produced on record the documents copy letter dated 24-11-2009 Ext. PW1/B and copy of letter dated 31-7-2023 Ext. PW1/C.

7. Respondents on the other hand have examined Dr. Lal Singh s/o Late Shri Amar Singh, Block Medical Officer, Health Block Rohanda, Tehsil Sunder Nagar, District Mandi by way of affidavit Ext. RW1/A. He has also produced on record copy of Governing Body Meeting Ext. RW1/B, letter dated 31-7-2023 Ext. RW1/C, Notification dated 16-8-2021 Ext. RW1/D and another notification dated 16-8-2021 Ext. RW1/E.

8. I have heard the learned Authorized Representative/Counsel for the petitioner as well as learned Dy. D.A. for the respondents at length and records perused.

9. For the reasons to be recorded hereinafter while discussing the issues for determination, my findings thereon are as under:

| | |
|---|---|
| Issue No. 1 | : Partly Yes |
| Issue No. 2 | : Decided accordingly |
| Issue No. 3 | : No |
| Issue No. 4 | : No |
| Issue No. 5 | : No |
| Relief. | : Claim petition is partly allowed per operative portion of the Award. |

## REASONS FOR FINDINGS

**Issue No. 1**

10. The petitioner in her affidavit has asserted that she was engaged as a sweeper under the health department in January, 2009. She was employed at Primary Health Centre, Kanaid under the control of Block Medical Officer Rohanda and Medical Officer Primary Health Centre Kanaid. She has asserted that her selection was made after an interview and was made against existing post

of sweeper. These averments have been denied on oath by RW1 Dr. Lal Singh who has asserted that petitioner was appointed as sweeper at Rogi Kalyan Samiti. Copy of letter from Medical Officer, Health Mandi to BMO Rohanda forwarding application of petitioner is produced on record as Ext. PW1/B. He also states that all the payments to the petitioner were made by Rogi Kalyan Samiti and replying respondent had no concern with it. He has denied that respondents have called application for the post of sweeper and also interviewed and selected the petitioner as sweeper against the vacant post. It is however admitted partially that petitioner worked from April, 2012 to 31-8-2023. The petitioner has submitted that she continuously worked with the respondent upto 31-8-2023 completed more than 240 days of work in each calendar year and specifically 240 days of work in 12 months preceding her alleged termination. In her cross-examination she has admitted that she was appointed by Rogi Kalyan Samiti and not by the respondents no.1 to 4. She also admits that in the year 2009 she was appointed at maximum wage of Rs.800/- per month and this payment was made to her by Rogi Kalyan Samiti and not by the respondents. She denied that respondents have not asked her to apply for the post of sweeper though she admits that no interview was conducted. She also admits that a notice was issued to her regarding her termination. She admits that in place of Rogi Kalyan Samiti scheme now Jan Arogya Samiti has been constituted at PHC level. She is unaware of the fact that there is no provision for hiring person under Jan Arogya Samiti. She has further asserted that there are regular sweepers and other sweepers who are alternatively doing the work.

11. RW1 Dr. Lal Singh has asserted that the services of Smt. Bimla Devi were disengaged on 1-8-2023 on compliance of guidelines of Jan Arogya Samiti as there was no provisions for hiring manpower under Jan Arogya Samiti. He also asserts that the petitioner was directed to work at the rate remuneration payable Rs. 600/- per month only by Rogi Kalyan Samiti.

12. In his cross-examination he has admitted that petitioner was engaged at Primary Health Centre Kanaid, Tehsil Sunder Nagar, District Mandi. He further admits that Pimary Health Centre Kanaid is working under the control and supervision of Block Medical Officer, Rohanda. He also states that petitioner was engaged by then Rogi Kalyan Samiti which is now named as Jan Arogya Samiti. He admits that no appointment letter was issued to the petitioner by Rogi Kalyan Samiti and added that appointment of petitioner was on the basis of resolution by the samiti and temporary in nature. He has admitted that from the year 2009 upto 31-7-2023 the petitioner had continuously worked with Rogi Kalyan Samiti at PHC Kanaid. He has however mentioned that the petitioner was on part-time basis and during this period she was paid wages continuously. He has alleged that petitioner was asked to work only twice a week on fixed wages. However he has shown his ignorance to the suggestion that part-time workers are appointed for working particular hours per day and not for working on particular days of a week. He admits that Rogi Kalyan Samiti is wing of department of health. He has himself stated that RKS is constituted by members from government, health department, local representative and general members of the society. He further admitted that wages are being paid from resources generated by Rogi Kalyan Samiti now Jan Arogya Samiti. He further admits that services of petitioner were terminated on the basis of Ext. RW1/C. He admits that at the time of retrenchment of the services of petitioner by the respondent department she was not paid any compensation.

13. Learned Authorized Representative/Counsel for the petitioner has vehemently argued that while terminating the services of the petitioner the respondents have failed to comply with the mandatory provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 as she was not paid any compensation or pay in lieu of notice at the time of her disengagement. It is admitted fact that petitioner has worked with respondents from the year 2009 upto 31-7-2023 continuously. There is no distinction made under Section 2 Clause S of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 between a part-time worker and other workmen. Respondents admitted the continuous engagement of the petitioner from the year 2009 upto 31-7-2023 but they have failed to produce the day to day record of the work done by her. It is

not disputed that she had continuously worked with the respondents so as to make her eligible within the ambit of Section 25 Clause B of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

14. The respondents have tried to evade their responsibility with regard to compensation benefits of the petitioner on the ground that the petitioner was appointed by Rogi Kalyan Samiti. It is pertinent to mention here that RW1 Dr. Lal Singh has admitted that Rogi Kalyan Samiti is now named as Jan Arogya Samiti and that the petitioner was engaged at Primary Health Centre Kanaid, Tehsil Sunder Nagar, District Mandi. The proceedings of Rogi Kalyan Samiti which have been produced on record as Ext. RW1/B also show that BMO and AMO are the important members of Rogi Kalyan Samiti. It is an admitted fact that now Jan Arogya Samiti is working in place of Rogi Kalyan Samiti both these institutions are being created and operated by department of health and the officers related to it. The notification regarding the creation of Rogi Kalyan Samiti as well as Jan Arogya Samiti establish that these are created by the Government of Himachal Pradesh and the expenditure of manpower are also made by the Government through respondent department. In these circumstances it cannot be considered that Rogi Kalyan Samiti is an independent institution not working under control and supervision of the present respondents. The termination of the petitioner was carried out on the basis of document Ext. RW1/C which describes one month's notice but no compensation or pay in lieu of notice vide Section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 has been paid to the petitioner. This fact has been admitted by RW1 Dr. Lal Singh also. The reference subsequently made to this court is with regard to illegal termination of the services of the petitioner hence confining to the finding to this extent, it is established that respondents have terminated the services of the petitioner without complying with the mandatory provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 it is illegal and unjustified. Issue no.1 is accordingly partly decided in the favour of the petitioner.

**Issue No. 2**

15. It has been proved from the overwhelming evidence that the services of petitioner were terminated without mandatory compliance of Section 25 Clause F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. There is not enough evidence to show that any other person have been appointed in the place of petitioner after her illegal termination. Thus considering the fact that respondents are proved to have violated the provisions of Section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the petitioner is held entitled to the relief of reinstatement on similar terms along-with lump sum compensation of Rs.50,000/- to be paid by the respondents to the petitioner. Issue no.2 is decided accordingly.

**Issues No. 3, 4 and 5**

16. The onus of proving these issues was on the respondent. The maintainability of the claim petition was primarily challenged on the ground that petitioner was appointed by Rogi Kalyan Samiti not by the present respondents. It is proved from evidence on record that Rogi Kalyan Samiti and now named as Jan Arogya Samiti are the instrumentalities of respondents' institution. Since the services of petitioner were terminated in violation of basic provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 the present claim is maintainable. No fact emerged to show that petitioner has concealed the material facts from this court and there was no other necessary party essential for the proper adjudication of the dispute. Hence issues no.3 to 5 are decided in the favour of the petitioner and against the respondents.

**RELIEF**

17. In view of my discussion on the issues no. 1 to 5 above, the claim petition succeeds and is partly allowed. The petitioner is held entitled to the relief of reinstatement on

similar terms along-with lump sum compensation of Rs.50,000/- to be paid by the respondents to the petitioner. Parties are left to bear their costs.

18. The reference is answered in aforesaid terms. A copy of this Award be sent to the appropriate Government for publication in the official gazette. File after due completion be consigned to the Record Room.

Announced in the open Court today, this 26th day of February, 2026.

Sd/-
(PARVEEN CHAUHAN),
*Presiding Judge,*
*Labour Court*-cum-*Industrial Tribunal,*
*Kangra at Dharamshala (H.P.).*

---

**IN THE COURT OF PARVEEN CHAUHAN, PRESIDING JUDGE, LABOUR COURT-CUM-INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, KANGRA AT DHARAMSHALA (H.P.)**

Reference No. : 10/2025
Date of Institution : 28-2-2025
Date of Decision : 26-2-2026

Smt. Savitri Devi w/o Shri Mast Ram, r/o Village & Post Office Khurahal, Tehsil Sunder Nagar, District Mandi, H.P. ..*Petitioner.*

*Versus*

1. The Director, Health Services Himachal Pradesh, Shimla.
2. The Chief Medical Officer, Mandi, District Mandi, H.P.
3. The Block Medical Officer, Rohanda, Tehsil Sunder Nagar, District Mandi, H.P.
4. The Medical Officer, Primary Health Centre Khurahal, Tehsil Sunder Nagar, District Mandi, H.P. ..*Respondents.*

**Reference under Section 10 (1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947**

For the Petitioner : Sh. N.L. Kaundal, Ld. AR
: Sh. Vijay Kaundal, Ld. Adv.
For Respondent(s) : Sh. Satish Thakur, Ld. Dy. D.A.

**AWARD**

The following industrial disputes has been received by this court for the purpose of adjudication from the appropriate authority/Deputy Labour Commissioner:—

"Whether the termination of services of Smt. Savitri Devi W/O Shri Mast Ram, R/O Village & Post Office Khurahal, Tehsil Sunder Nagar, District Mandi, H.P. by (i) The Director, Health Services Himachal Pradesh, Shimla (ii) The Chief Medical Officer, Mandi, District Mandi, H.P. (iii) The Block Medical Officer, Rohanda, Tehsil Sunder Nagar, District Mandi, H.P., (iv) The Medical Officer, Primary Health Centre Khurahal, Tehsil Sunder Nagar, District Mandi, H.P., *w.e.f.* 01-09-2023 without complying with the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, is legal

and justified? If not, what relief of reinstatement, back wages, seniority regularization, past service benefits and amount of compensation the above aggrieved workman is entitled to from the above employers?"

2. The brief facts as stated in the claim petition are that Health Department, Government of Himachal Pradesh filled up some vacancies on different posts against vacant post of regular/permanent employee whose services were retired by government after attaining superannuation. The respondent department required the application of candidates for the post of sweeper and petitioner submitted an application before Chief Medical Officer and then Block Medical Officer, Rohanda called the petitioner for interview. The interviews was conducted and petitioner was selected by the department thereafter she was appointed in the month of January, 2008 in the capacity of sweeper against sanctioned post. She was not however given any appointment letter and no terms and conditions were settled with her by the respondents. It is further submitted that from January, 2008 to 31-8-2023 the work and conduct of the petitioner was satisfactory and upto the mark as she never gave any chance to the respondents for any misconduct and did not receive show cause notice. Her services were satisfactory for the said period and she was getting the salary after a gap of 2/3 months as per minimum wages enhanced by the Government of Himachal Pradesh Finance Department time to time. It is alleged that services of petitioner were unlawfully terminated by the respondent no.4 the Medical Officer, Primary Health Centre Khurahal, Tehsil Sunder Nagar, District Mandi, H.P. It is asserted that petitioner completed more than 240 days of work in each and every calendar year from January, 2008 to 31-8-2023. She completed 240 days of work in 12 months immediately preceding her termination thus she was covered in the definition of continuous service under Section 25-B of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and Section 25-F Clause (b) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 was also applicable to the petitioner at the time of her termination. It is alleged that respondents have not served any show cause notice to the petitioner for any alleged misconduct nor any inquiry was conducted against her. After the termination of the petitioner respondents appointed new persons on services in her place on outsource basis thus petitioner was unlawfully terminated and deprived of her permanent status of regularization as per policy of the Government. It is alleged that the act and conduct of the respondent amounted to unfair labour practice against the mandatory provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. It is prayed that the termination order dated 1-8-2023 is liable to be quashed as it violates Articles 14, 16 and 21 of the Constitution. Petitioner has prayed that her illegal termination dated 1-8-2023 may be set aside and she be reinstated in her service along-with seniority in service and full back wages. She also prayed that the respondents be directed to pay different arrears of wages in favour of the petitioner after regularizing her services on completion of seven years of continuous service.

3. In reply to the claim petition preliminary objections qua maintainability, concealment of material facts etc. have been raised. It is asserted that petitioner was served with one month's notice before her termination and she was appointed by Rogi Kalyan Samiti and not by the replying respondents. On merits, it is admitted that petitioner was appointed as sweeper by Rogi Kalyan Samiti and she was directed to work two times in a week. Her maximum wages were fixed Rs.800/- per month in the year 2009. All the payments were made to the petitioner by Rogi Kalyan Samiti and replying respondents had no concern with it. It is admitted that petitioner worked from January, 2009 till 31-8-2023. She was served one month's notice regarding termination of service as per directions of respondents no.1 and 2 by Secretary Health Government of Himachal Pradesh notification No.HFW-A(2)5/2019 dated 16-8-2021 Jan Arogya Samiti was made to function and replaced Rogi Kalyan Samiti at PHC level. The CHC's/CH's are still governed by Rogi Kalyan Samiti guidelines. Respondents have submitted that there is no provisions of keeping part time worker in Primary Health Centre Khurahal. It is also submitted that there is no provision of hiring manpower for carrying cleanliness/sanitation work at health institutions by Jan Arogya Samiti. Other averments made in the petition were denied and it is prayed that the claim of the petitioner deserves to be dismissed.

4. In rejoinder to the reply filed on behalf of respondents preliminary objections were denied facts stated in the petition are reasserted and reaffirmed.

5. On the basis of the pleadings of the parties, the following issues were framed for adjudication and determination:—

1. Whether the respondents have terminated the services of the petitioner *w.e.f.* 01-09-2023 without complying with the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 is illegal and unjustified, as alleged? ..*OPP.*

2. If issue No.1 is proved in affirmative, whether the petitioner is entitled to reinstatement, back wages, seniority, regularization, past service benefits and amount of compensation, as claimed? ..*OPP.*

3. Whether the claim petition is not maintainable, as alleged? ..*OPRs.*

4. Whether the petitioner has concealed the material facts from the Court, as alleged? ..*OPRs.*

5. Whether the claim petition is bad for non-joinder of the necessary party, as alleged? ..*OPR.*

Relief.

6. The petitioner in order to prove her case has examined herself as PW1 and produced on record her affidavit Ext. PW1/A wherein she has reiterated the facts stated in the claim petition. She has also produced on record the documents copy of demand notice dated 1-11-2023 Ext. PW1/B, copy of letter dated 23-3-2012 Ext. PW1/C and copy of proceedings dated 28-2-2012 Ext. PW1/D.

7. Respondents on the other hand have examined Dr. Lal Singh s/o Late Shri Amar Singh, Block Medical Officer, Health Block Rohanda, Tehsil Sunder Nagar, District Mandi by way of affidavit Ext. RW1/A. He has also produced on record the copy of appointment letter Ext. RW1/B, copy of letter dated 1-8-2023 Ext. RW1/C, Notification dated 16-8-2021 Ext. RW1/D and affidavit Smt. Savitri Devi Ext. RW1/E.

8. I have heard the learned Authorized Representative/Counsel for the petitioner as well as learned Dy. D.A. for the respondents at length and records perused.

9. For the reasons to be recorded hereinafter while discussing the issues for determination, my findings thereon are as under:

| | |
|---|---|
| Issue No. 1 | : Partly Yes |
| Issue No. 2 | : Decided accordingly |
| Issue No. 3 | : No |
| Issue No. 4 | : No |
| Issue No. 5 | : No |
| Relief. | : Claim petition is partly allowed per operative portion of the Award. |

**REASONS FOR FINDINGS**

**Issue No. 1**

10. The petitioner in her affidavit has asserted that she was engaged as a sweeper under the health department in January, 2008. She was employed at Primary Health Centre, Khurahal under the control of Block Medical Officer Rohanda and Medical Officer Primary Health Centre Khurahal. She has asserted that her selection was made after an interview and was made against existing post of sweeper. These averments have been denied on oath by RW1 Dr. Lal Singh who has asserted that petitioner was appointed as sweeper at Rogi Kalyan Samiti. Copy of letter of appointment by member secretary Rogi Kalyan Samiti is produced on record Ext. RW1/B. He also states that all the payments to the petitioner were made by Rogi Kalyan Samiti and replying respondent had no concern with it. He has denied that respondents have called application for the post of sweeper and also interviewed and selected the petitioner as sweeper against the vacant post. It is however admitted partially that petitioner worked from April, 2012 to 31-8-2023. The petitioner has submitted that she continuously worked with the respondent upto 31-8-2023 completed more than 240 days of work in each calendar year and specifically 240 days of work in 12 months preceding her alleged termination. In her cross-examination she has admitted that she was appointed by Rogi Kalyan Samiti and not by the respondents no.1 to 4. She also admits that in the year 2009 she was appointed at minimum wage of Rs. 800/- per month and this payment was made to her by Rogi Kalyan Samiti and not by the respondents. She denied that respondents have not asked her to apply for the post of sweeper though she admits that no interview was conducted. She also admits that a notice was issued to her regarding her termination. She admits that in place of Rogi Kalyan Samiti scheme now Jan Arogya Samiti has been constituted at PHC level. She is unaware of fat that there is no provision for hiring person under Jan Arogya Samiti. She has further asserted that there are regular sweepers and other sweepers who are alternatively doing the work.

11. RW1 Dr. Lal Singh has asserted that the services of Smt. Savitri Devi were disengaged on 1-8-2023 on compliance of guidelines of Jan Arogya Samiti as there was no provisions for hiring manpower under Jan Arogya Samiti. He also asserts that the petitioner was directed to work at the rate remuneration payable Rs. 600/- per month only by Rogi Kalyan Samiti.

12. In his cross-examination he has admitted that petitioner was engaged at Primary Health Centre Khurahal, Tehsil Sunder Nagar, District Mandi. He further admits that Pimary Health Centre Khurahal is working under the control and supervision of Block Medical Officer, Rohanda. He also states that petitioner was engaged by then Rogi Kalyan Samiti which is now named as Jan Arogya Samiti. He admits that no appointment letter was issued to the petitioner by Rogi Kalyan Samiti. He further admitted that Ext. RW1/B has been provided by Member Secretary, Rogi Kalyan Samiti-*cum*-Medical Officer Incharge, Primary Health Centre Khurahal, District Mandi. He admits that from the year 2012 upto 31-7-2023 the petitioner has continuously worked with Rogi Kalyan Samiti at Primary Health Centre Khurahal. He has however mentioned that the petitioner was on part-time basis and during this period she was paid wages continuously. He has alleged that petitioner was asked to work only twice a week on fixed wages. However he has shown his ignorance to the suggestion that part-time workers are appointed for working particular hours per day and not for working on particular days of a week. He admits that Rogi Kalyan Samiti is wing of department of health. He has himself stated that RKS is constituted by members from government, health department, local representative and general members of the society. He further admitted that wages are being paid from resources generated by Rogi Kalyan Samiti now Jan Arogya Samiti. He further admits that services of petitioner were terminated on the basis of Ext. RW1/C. He admits that at the time of retrenchment of the services of petitioner by the respondent department she was not paid any compensation.

13. Learned Authorized Representative/Counsel for the petitioner has vehemently argued that while terminating the services of the petitioner the respondents have failed to comply with the mandatory provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 as she was not paid any compensation or pay in lieu of notice at the time of her disengagement. It is important to peruse the document Ext. RW1/B the document pertains to approval for providing of sweeper services at PHC Khurahal. The careful perusal of document shows that though the services was temporary but were to be provided during institutional hours and also as and when on requirement basis. It is admitted fact that petitioner has worked with respondents from the year 2012 upto 31-7-2023 continuously. There is no distinction made under Section 2 Clause S of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 between a part-time worker and other workmen. Respondents admitted the continuous engagement of the petitioner from the year 2012 upto 31-7-2023 but they have failed to produce the day to day record of the work done by her. It is not disputed that she had continuously worked with the respondents so as to make her eligible within the ambit of Section 25 Clause B of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

14. The respondents have tried to evade their responsibility with regard to compensation benefits of the petitioner on the ground that the petitioner was appointed by Rogi Kalyan Samiti. It is pertinent to mention here that RW1 Dr. Lal Singh has admitted that Rogi Kalyan Samiti is now named as Jan Arogya Samiti and that the petitioner was engaged at Primary Health Centre Khurahal, Tehsil Sunder Nagar, District Mandi. The proceedings of Rogi Kalyan Samiti which have been produced on record as Ext. PW1/D also show that BMO and AMO are the important members of Rogi Kalyan Samiti. The appointment of petitioner was also made by Secretary Rogi Kalyan Samiti-*cum*-Medical Officer Incharge, Primary Health Centre, Khurahal, District Mandi vide Ext. RW1/B. It is an admitted fact that now Jan Arogya Samiti is working in place of Rogi Kalyan Samiti both these institutions are being created and operated by department of health and the officers related to it. The notification regarding the creation of Rogi Kalyan Samiti as well as Jan Arogya Samiti establish that these are created by the Government of Himachal Pradesh and the expenditure of manpower are also made by the Government through respondent department. In these circumstances it cannot be considered that Rogi Kalyan Samiti is an independent institution not working under control and supervision of the present respondents. The termination of the petitioner was carried out on the basis of document Ext. RW1/C which describes one month's notice but no compensation or pay in lieu of notice vide Section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 has been paid to the petitioner. This fact has been admitted by RW1 Dr. Lal Singh also. The reference subsequently made to this court is with regard to illegal termination of the services of the petitioner hence confining to the finding to this extent, it is established that respondents have terminated the services of the petitioner without complying with the mandatory provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 it is illegal and unjustified. Issue no.1 is accordingly partly decided in the favour of the petitioner.

**Issue No. 2**

15. It has been proved from the overwhelming evidence that the services of petitioner were terminated without mandatory compliance of Section 25 Clause F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. There is not enough evidence to show that any other person have been appointed in the place of petitioner after her illegal termination. Thus considering the fact that respondents are proved to have violated the provisions of Section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the petitioner is held entitled to the relief of reinstatement on similar terms along-with lump sum compensation of Rs.50,000/- to be paid by the respondents to the petitioner. Issue no. 2 is decided accordingly.

**Issues No. 3, 4 and 5**

16. The onus of proving these issues was on the respondent. The maintainability of the claim petition was primarily challenged on the ground that petitioner was appointed by Rogi

Kalyan Samiti not by the present respondents. It is proved from evidence on record that Rogi Kalyan Samiti and now named as Jan Arogya Samiti are the instrumentalities of respondents' institution. Since the services of petitioner were terminated in violation of basic provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 the present claim is maintainable. No fact emerged to show that petitioner has concealed the material facts from this court and there was no other necessary party essential for the proper adjudication of the dispute. Hence issues no.3 to 5 are decided in the favour of the petitioner and against the respondents.

**RELIEF**

17. In view of my discussion on the issues no. 1 to 5 above, the claim petition succeeds and is partly allowed. The petitioner is held entitled to the relief of reinstatement on similar terms along-with lump sum compensation of Rs. 50,000/- to be paid by the respondents to the petitioner. Parties are left to bear their costs.

18. The reference is answered in aforesaid terms. A copy of this Award be sent to the appropriate Government for publication in the official gazette. File after due completion be consigned to the Record Room.

Announced in the open Court today, this 26th day of February, 2026.

Sd/-
(PARVEEN CHAUHAN),
*Presiding Judge,*
*Labour Court*-cum-*Industrial Tribunal,*
*Kangra at Dharamshala (H.P.)*

---

**IN THE COURT OF PARVEEN CHAUHAN, PRESIDING JUDGE, LABOUR COURT-CUM-INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, KANGRA AT DHARAMSHALA (H.P.)**

Reference No. : 691/2016
Date of Institution : 03-10-2016
Date of Decision : 26-2-2026

Piar Chand s/o Shri Sher Singh, r/o Village Bandla, P.O. Nachhir, Tehsil Palampur, District Kangra, H.P. ..*Petitioner.*

*Versus*

1. M/s Om Power Corporation Ltd., Neugal Hydro Electric Project, Village Bundla, P.O. Nachhir, Tehsil Palampur, District Kangra, H.P.

*2.* Project Manager, M/s Om Power Corporation Ltd., Neugal Hydro Electric Project, Village Bundla, P.O. Nachhir, Tehsil Palampur, District Kangra, H.P. ..*Respondents.*

**Reference under Section 10 (1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947**

For the Petitioner : Sh. N.L. Kaundal, Ld. AR
: Sh.Vijay Kaundal, Ld. Adv.
For Respondent(s) : Sh. Tarun Sharma, Ld. Adv.

**AWARD**

The following industrial disputes has been received by this court for the purpose of adjudication from the appropriate authority/Joint Labour Commissioner:—

"Whether the termination of the services of Shri Piar Chand s/o Shri Sher Singh, r/o Village Bandla, P.O. Nachhir, Tehsil Palampur, District Kangra, H.P. by the Project Manager, M/s Om Hydropower Ltd., Village Bandla, P.O. Nachhir, Palampur, District Kangra, H.P. *w.e.f.* 28-03-2013 without complying with the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, as alleged by the workman, is legal and justified? If not, what amount of back wages, seniority, past service benefits and amount of compensation the above aggrieved worker is entitled to from the above Management?"

2. The brief facts as stated in the claim petition are that the petitioner was on the employment of respondent as supervisor *w.e.f.* 2006 and had continuously employed with the respondent uptil 1-5-2013. He had rendered more than 240 days of service in each years preceding the date of his initial engagement. While terminating the services of the petitioner no charge-sheet, enquiry or show cause notice were ever issued to the petitioner as well as no personal hearing was given to him. It is asserted that neither the petitioner served one month's notice nor paid wages from February 2013 till May, 2013 despite work. The one month's mandatory wages were also not paid to the petitioner and as such termination was illegal, void and bad in law under Section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. Neither the compensation payable under Section 25-F (b) of Industrial Disputes Act was paid nor tendered to be paid till date as the termination of petitioner was illegal void ab initio as well as the termination of the petitioner was without any reason and based on hire and fire policy only. It is asserted that while terminating the services of the petitioner the action of the respondent was without any reason, rules and against the spirit of Industrial Disputes Act. It is alleged that once the Labour Inspector had sent the case to the appropriate authority, the respondent initiated fictitious so-called enquiry which was mere an eye wash and nothing else. It is further alleged that the allegations made against the petitioner were false and fictitious and one sided enquiry was not tenable in the eyes of law, the same was clear from memorandum dated 17-10-2014 and the same was issued after 20 months and during this period no allowance of salary or other benefits were given to the petitioner. In accordance with the memorandum respondent had alleged that petitioner and others committed theft of GI Sheets however the GI Sheets were located by the respondent near four way security office of respondent where all the material was stacked and as such there was no theft and no FIR and the conclusion of inquiry was totally false and wrong just to harass the petitioner malafidely and the same is bad in the eyes of law. It is alleged that proper enquiry procedure was not followed by the respondent and the statement of petitioner was written by the respondent employees on its own. It is alleged that there was no independent enquiry conducted by the enquiry officer and no defence assistance was provided to the petitioner. The conclusion of respondent qua hut of petitioner is altogether wrong false incurred and denied. The respondent had not produced any revenue document i.e. parcha jamabandi and in the absence of such documents the conclusion in enquiry was clearly malafide and same was biased against the petitioner. The petitioner is unemployed yet and hand to mouth without any job. The petitioner through counsel Shri Diya Bhanu Singh, Advocate Palampur had served legal notice which was duly replied on 23-12-2013 wherein the respondent levelled false and frivolous allegation against petitioner which were not inquired and no enquiry was constituted. It is asserted that the juniors were retained in service and thereafter he (petitioner) had approached various authorities but of no avail. It is asserted that the present petition is maintainable and the impugned termination order of petitioner had visited him with evil consequence and the same could not have been passed without notice or prior hearing just to comply with the minimum requirement of law, fairness and principles of natural justice. Petitioner alleged that the respondent has violated Article 14 to 16 of Constitution and violated the principles of natural justice. It is asserted that the

action of the respondent was illegal, arbitrary, malafide, unconstitutional and against the principle of natural justice and as such liable to be set aside and the present reference be honoured. Petitioner has submitted that he has not suppressed any facts having approached the court with clean hand and the petitioner is not estopped in any manner to file the present complaint. There was no matter registered in police against the petitioner as no offence at any point of time had been committed by him. The petitioner had never abandoned the service of respondents however he was illegally terminated from services. There was no wilful absence of the petitioner from the job from 29-3-2023 as no charge sheet, no inquiry or show cause notice were given to the petitioner before his termination. It is alleged that the termination of the petitioner was illegal, void and bad in the eyes of law as per Section 25-F (b) of the Industrial Disputes Act. At the time of termination of the services of petitioner he was discharged from his duties in the capacity of semi skilled worker. While terminating the services of the petitioner the respondents management had retained juniors workers to the petitioner namely Sh. Ranjeet Singh (1-4-2007), Surender (2-4-2008), Ram Singh (1-7-2007), Rakesh Kumar (1-7-2008), Surjeet Kumar (11-4-2009) and Roshan Lal (11-4-2009) clearly violated the provisions of Section 25-G of the Industrial Disputes Act. It is further submitted that when petitioner came to know from reliable sources that after his termination the management respondents appointed new person in his place without affording him an opportunity was clearly violative of the provisions of Section 25-H of the Industrial Disputes Act. It is submitted that the demand notice was issued to the respondent with regard to his unlawful termination and copy of the same was forwarded to the Labour Inspector-cum-Conciliation Officer, Palampur but no reply to the demand notice was filed by the respondents. In view of the above, the petitioner prayed that illegal termination of petitioner i.e. 28-3-2013 may be set aside and quashed and respondents be directed to reinstate the service of the petitioner with full back wages, seniority, continuity of service and all other consequential service benefits.

3. In reply to the claim petition preliminary submissions qua suppression of material facts and petitioner not coming to the court with clean hands have been raised. On merits, it is submitted that the petitioner was initially engaged as unskilled worker from July, 2006 to March, 2011 and elevated subsequently as a semi skilled worker from April, 2001 with the company. His services were never dispensed with on 28-3-2013 as claimed by him. It is asserted that the services of the petitioner were not terminated in the year 2013 *w.e.f.* 28-3-2013 as alleged by the petitioner hence the question of observance of the provisions of 25-F of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 do not arise. It is alleged that petitioner stopped to attend the office at his own in order to evade the inquiry ordered against him by the management. During the course of conciliation proceedings it was on persuasion of the Labour Inspector, Palampur as on 27-10-2014 whereas the petitioner agreed to associate himself in the inquiry ordered against him. Inquiry was conducted against him affording full opportunity to defend himself and he was also given option to engage his defence assistance or defend himself at his own. He elected the later one and refused to engage any defence assistant for the purpose and eight number of hearings were fixed in the inquiry. He was given full opportunity to cross-examine the prosecution witnesses and to produce his own witnesses. Efforts were made to extend full opportunity to him as guaranteed under natural cannons of justice. After perusal of inquiry report received from the inquiry officer and as such the respondent issued show cause notice on 30-5-2015 to show the cause within stipulated period as to why he should not be removed from service keeping in view the gravity of charges proven against him in the inquiry. On receipt of the notice the petitioner had apprehended his removal from service approached the labour inspector and thereafter his demand note/application was forwarded to the Labour Commissioner by the labour inspector was culminated in the instant reference dated 8-9-2016 before the petitioner was removed from service vide respondent order No.OHL/Admin/2015-16/Lr.2, dated 21-10-2015 *w.e.f.* 29-3-2013 the date from which he (petitioner) was on wilful absence. It is submitted that the assertions made by the petitioner with regard to incidents about theft of armoured cable and G1 sheets are totally denied as the same stand at variance of the facts. After the theft of the cable on 26-3-2013 the inquiry was ordered against the individual and memorandum containing details of

charges was served upon the petitioner. Inquiry was conducted by the inquiry officer impartially observed all fait accompli principles outlined for such inquiries and affording full opportunity to the petitioner as per cannons of natural justice. It is nonetheless added that a tin roofed hut a stop gap arrangement was situated at a place named Kaun Area at a distance of approximately 400m from Valve House and Forebay site of the project. The petitioner and his family member belong to nomadic tribe which move hither and thither with their livestock for grazing in meadows located in adjoining mountains and the same was used by the petitioner and his family. It is asserted that the petitioner was removed from service as a result of disciplinary action taken against him for the charges contained in the charge-sheet served upon him. Therefore his case was not governed by the provisions of retrenchment as contained in Industrial Disputes Act. It is asserted that the petitioner had filed an application before the Labour Inspector after prolonged period of 17 months ensued from the date of his wilful absence. It is asserted that the services of petitioner were dispensed with following disciplinary proceedings. It is asserted that provisions of Section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act are not attracted in the petitioner's case. All other averments made parawise in the petition are denied and it is prayed that the petition deserves to be dismissed.

4. In rejoinder preliminary objections were denied facts stated in the petition are reasserted and reaffirmed.

5. On the basis of the pleadings of the parties, the following issues were framed for adjudication and determination:-

1. Whether termination of the services of the petitioner by the respondent w.e.f. 28-03-2013 is/was improper and unjustified as alleged? ..*OPP.*

1(a) Whether the inquiry conducted by the respondent against the petitioner was legal, justified and in accordance with the procedure of principle of natural justice, as claimed? (as framed on 15-10-2024) ..*OPR.*

2. If issue No.1 is proved in affirmative, to what benefits the petitioner is entitled to? ..*OPP.*

3. Whether the petitioner has concealed material facts from this court as alleged? ..*OPR.*

4. Whether the petitioner has not come to the court with clean hands as alleged? ..*OPR.*

Relief.

6. The petitioner in order to prove his case examined himself as PW1 by way of affidavit Ext. PW1/A wherein he has reiterated the facts stated in the claim petition. He has also produced on record letter dated 27-10-2014 Ext. PW1/B, reply to show cause notice dated 27-10-2014 Ext. PW1/C, notification dated 8-9-2016t Ext. PW1/D and reply to show cause notice dated 3-5-2015 Ext. PW1/E. Petitioner has also examined one Shri Dev Chand, Labour Inspector, Palampur as PW2 by way of examination-in-chief wherein he has stated that the conciliation proceedings are correct as per his record and same is Ext. PW2/A and copy of demand notice Ext. PW2/B. He has stated that no reply to the demand notice was filed during conciliation.

7. Respondent on the other hand has examined Shri Dinesh Kumar, Deputy Manager, Om Hydropower Ltd. by way of affidavit Ext. RW1/A wherein she has reiterated the facts mentioned in the reply. He has also produced on record copy of letter dated 28-3-2013 Ext. RW1/B, copy of

order of suspension dated 29-3-2013 Ext. RW1/C, copy of police report dated 2-4-2013 Ext. RW1/D, copy of non delivery report dated 19-1-2013 Ext. RW1/E, copy of notice dated 26-8-2014 Ext. RW1/F, copy of demand notice dated 30-7-2014 Ext. RW1/G, copy of letter dated 2-9-2014 Ext. RW1/H, copy of conciliation proceeding dated 27.10.2014 Ext. RW1/J (two pages), copy of disciplinary proceeding dated 18-10-2014 Ext. RW1/K, copy of documents for inquiry dated 18-10-2014 Ext.RW1/L, copy of memorandum dated 4-4-2013 Ext. RW1/M, (4 pages) copy of letter dated 17-10-2014 Ext. RW1/N (4 pages), copy of letter dated 17-10-2014 Ext. RW1/O, copy of letter dated 17-10-2014 Ext. RW1/P, copy of show cause notice dated 30-5-2015 Ext. RW1/Q, copy of termination dated 21-10-2015 Ext. RW1/R, copy of reference dated 8-9-2016 Ext. RW1/S, copy of payment receipt Ext. RW1/T (2 pages), photographs Mark A1 to Mark A7, copy of authorization letter dated 29-2-2016 Ext. RW1/U, and copy of inquiry report Ext. RW1/V (23 pages). Respondent has also examined one Shri Arvind Bhardwaj, Senior Executive (HR & Admin), Om Hydropower Limited by way of affidavit Ext. RW2/A.

8. I have heard the learned Counsel for both the parties at length and records perused.

9. For the reasons to be recorded hereinafter while discussing the issues for determination, my findings thereon are as under:

| | |
|---|---|
| Issue No. 1 | : Partly Yes |
| Issue No. 1(a) | : No |
| Issue No. 2 | : Decided accordingly |
| Issue No. 3 | : No |
| Issue No. 4 | : No |
| Relief. | : Claim petition is partly allowed per operative portion of the Award. |

**REASONS FOR FINDINGS**

**Issue No.1 & 1(a)**

10. Both these issues are taken up together for the purpose of adjudication

11. The fact that petitioner was working as semi-skilled worker with the respondents continuously from 1-7-2006 to 28-3-2013 having completed 240 days service in each calendar year is not explicitly denied by the respondents. It is admitted that petitioner was an employee of respondents. The petitioner has alleged that on 28-3-20213 his services were illegally terminated consequent to which he had sent a demand notice dated 16-8-2014. RW1 Shri Dinesh Kumar, Deputy Manager, Om Hydropower Limited has however alleged that in April, 2012 CGI tin sheets stacked for construction of labour sheds were got stolen and on search some CGI sheets were recovered from the hut of petitioner in forest adjacent to the fore-bay site. This indicated his involvement in the theft of CGI sheets. The petitioner was laid off by verbal warnings. Again on 26-3-2013 another theft took place. The costly armoured electrical cable was cut at some point located nearby the fore-bay site and two persons at distance from the place of location were seen collecting cut pieces of cable and they fled taking advantage of darkness and ran away towards the hut of petitioner. The axe and scissor were found on the spot which belonged to the petitioner. Some parts of stolen cable were also burnt near the hut of Piar Chand (petitioner). The matter was reported to police and after interrogation by police the unburnt piece of cable were also recovered pointing towards the involvement of the petitioner in the theft. A suspension order and charge-sheet were prepared and the company was constrained to conduct a domestic inquiry. The petitioner did not report to work after 29-3-2015. After the receipt of notice from the Labour-*cum*-Conciliation Officer the inquiry proceedings were resumed as petitioner had earlier refused memorandum issued

to him. Learned Authorized Representative for the petitioner has argued that after passing suspension order no just and proper inquiry was initiated by the respondents. He submitted that no headquarters were fixed and no suspension allowance was paid to the petitioner. This made the petitioner not to attend the company premises consequently the demand notice was issued by petitioner against his illegal termination. The learned Authorized Representative/Counsel has also argued that the service petitioner was actually terminated on 29-3-2013 and no inquiry was initiated until the issuance of demand notice and appearance before Labour-*cum*-Conciliation Officer. There was no involvement of the petitioner in the alleged theft as no FIR was registered against him and no criminal proceedings were initiated. The inquiry proceedings were also not in accordance with the rules, procedure and principles of natural justice as disciplinary authority appeared as witness during the alleged inquiry proceedings. No opportunity of defense was ever afforded to the petitioner. No subsistence allowance was paid during alleged suspension period or even the period of alleged inquiry.

12. Learned Counsel for the respondents has however argued that the petitioner had deliberately absented from duty after 29-3-2013 and he refused the service of memorandum. On the directions of Labour Inspector petitioner agreed to cooperate in the inquiry and after just and proper inquiry proceedings his guilt was proved and his services were accordingly terminated. He has submitted that the opportunity of defense was duly afforded to the petitioner.

13. The daily station diary entry Ext. RW1/D shows that a complaint was made by Shri Ram Swaroop regarding the theft of wires belonging to respondents company. The burnt piece of wire and some cut pieces were also recovered. The petitioner was called for inquiry however nothing else transpired from the police record. The daily diary entry is dated 2-4-2013. The complaint was made before the police on 28-3-2013 vide Ext. RW1/D and suspension is dated 29-3-2013 Ext. RW1/E. It is alleged that petitioner had refused to accept memorandum vide report Ext. RW1/E. As pointed out by the learned Authorized Representative/Counsel for the petitioner there is no witness on record in the said report in whose presence the petitioner had refused to receive memorandum from official of the company. There is no charge-sheet pertaining to the petitioner or record of any other proceedings around that period. The suspension order did not mention when a domestic inquiry would be undertaken nor the explanation of the petitioner was called with regard to the memorandum issued to him. The respondents company neither prepared a charge-sheet nor proceedings of inquiry continued after the issuance of memorandum Ext. RW1/C. It is alleged that the petitioner had absented himself from the work but no suspension allowance was fixed nor he was asked to visit headquarter during alleged inquiry. The company had practically terminated the services of the petitioner after the suspension order and the salary of the petitioner was also not paid. It was only on the issuance of demand notice and appearance of parties before the Labour-*cum*-Conciliation Officer when the inquiry proceedings were resumed and allegedly the charge-sheet was served on the petitioner. There is again no documentary proof of service of charge-sheet and inquiry proceedings undertaken by the Inquiry Officer had not been produced nor any notice to participate in the inquiry was given to petitioner. It is not shown that during conduct of inquiry proceedings any suspension allowance was given. The unexplained delay in initiating inquiry proceedings does not appear be to the advantage of respondents company who had an option to proceed exparte in case memorandum/suspension order was duly served on the petitioner.

14. RW1 Shri Dinesh Kumar has admitted that no FIR was got registered against the petitioner. He had admitted that charge-sheet was issued by him. He has admitted that charge-sheet was not sent through registered post nor service of petitioner was done by way of publication. He has admitted that Shri Arvind Bhardwaj was appointed as Inquiry Officer and Shri Vinod Kumar was Presenting Officer by him. He admits that Arvind Bhardwaj was subordinate. He has stated that inquiry was internal and not a domestic inquiry. He admits that he appeared as witness in the

inquiry proceedings at serial no. 7. The inquiry officer Arvind Bhardwaj has admitted that the Shri Dinesh Kumar was appointing authority of the petitioner. He also admits that during inquiry no witness had deposed that the petitioner had committed theft in his presence. He admits that Dinesh Kumar had deposed as witness in the proceedings and record of proceedings is not produced in the court. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in **State of Uttar Pradesh v. Saroj Kumar Sinha, 2010 2 SCC 772** has also held as follows:—

> "**27**. A bare perusal of the aforesaid sub-rule shows that when the respondent had failed to submit the explanation to the charge-sheet it was incumbent upon the inquiry officer to fix a date for his appearance in the inquiry. It is only in a case when the government servant despite notice of the date fixed failed to appear that the inquiry officer can proceed with the inquiry ex parte. Even in such circumstances it is incumbent on the inquiry officer to record the statement of witnesses mentioned in the charge-sheet. Since the government servant is absent, he would clearly lose the benefit of cross-examination of the witnesses. But nonetheless in order to establish the charges the Department is required to produce the necessary evidence before the inquiry officer. This is so as to avoid the charge that the inquiry officer has acted as a prosecutor as well as a judge.
>
> **28**. An inquiry officer acting in a quasi-judicial authority is in the position of an independent adjudicator. He is not supposed to be a representative of the department/disciplinary authority/Government. His function is to examine the evidence presented by the Department, even in the absence of the delinquent official to see as to whether the unrebutted evidence is sufficient to hold that the charges are proved. In the present case the aforesaid procedure has not been observed. Since no oral evidence has been examined the documents have not been proved, and could not have been taken into consideration to conclude that the charges have been proved against the respondents.
>
> **30**. When a departmental enquiry is conducted against the government servant it cannot be treated as a casual exercise. The enquiry proceedings also cannot be conducted with a closed mind. The inquiry officer has to be wholly unbiased. The rules of natural justice are required to be observed to ensure not only that justice is done but is manifestly seen to be done. The object of rules of natural justice is to ensure that a government servant is treated fairly in proceedings which may culminate in imposition of punishment including dismissal/removal from service."

15. Similarly the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Mohd. Yunus Khan v. State of Uttar Pradesh, 2010 10 SCC 539** has held as follows:—

> "**28.** In *Arjun Chaubey v. Union of India* [(1984) 2 SCC 578 : 1984 SCC (L&S) 290 : AIR 1984 SC 1356] a Constitution Bench of this Court dealt with an identical case wherein an employee serving in the Northern Railway had been dismissed by the Deputy Chief Commercial Superintendent on a charge of misconduct which concerned himself, after considering by himself the explanation given by the employee against the charge and after thinking that the employee was not fit to be retained in service. It was also considered whether in such a case, the Court should deny the relief to the employee, even if the Court comes to the conclusion that the order of punishment stood vitiated on the ground that the employee had been guilty of habitual acts of indiscipline/misconduct. This Court held that the order of dismissal passed against the employee stood

vitiated as it was in utter disregard of the principles of natural justice. The main thrust of the charges against the employee related to his conduct qua the disciplinary authority itself, therefore, it was not open to the disciplinary authority to sit in judgment over the explanation furnished by the employee and decide against the delinquent. No person could be a judge in his own cause and no witness could certify that his own testimony was true. Anyone who had a personal stake in an enquiry must have kept himself aloof from the enquiry. The Court further held that in such a case it could not be considered that the employee did not deserve any relief from the Court since he was habitually guilty of acts subversive of discipline. The illegality from which the order of dismissal passed by the authority concerned suffered was of a character so grave and fundamental that the alleged habitual misbehavior of the delinquent employee could not cure or condone it.

**29.** Thus, the legal position emerges that if a person appears as a witness in disciplinary proceedings, he cannot be an enquiry officer nor can he pass the order of punishment as a disciplinary authority. This rule has been held to be sacred. An apprehension of bias operates as a disqualification for a person to act as adjudicator. No person can be a judge in his own cause and no witness can certify that his own testimony is true. Anyone who has personal interest in the disciplinary proceedings must keep himself away from such proceedings. The violation of the principles of natural justice renders the order null and void.

16. It is already mentioned that the respondents company had dispensed with the services of petitioner before conclusion of inquiry. No suspension allowance was fixed and no inquiry was conducted after 29-3-2013. Subsequently the inquiry was resumed and again the disciplinary authority himself appeared as witness during proceedings. The respondents has violated the basic tenets of natural justice which need to be followed in conducting a domestic inquiry so as to ensure fair trial while concluding the guilt and imposing penalty on the petitioner. The inquiry officer relied on circumstance which was not considered enough by the police to implicate the petitioner for the alleged theft of offence. On one hand suspension order was issued without fixing the suspension allowance and headquarter of the petitioner during suspension, on the other hand charge of wilful absence were also made against the petitioner. The fact that respondents has not made efforts to continue the inquiry proceedings after issuance of suspension orders itself points towards the termination of the petitioner without following due process as on 29-3-2013. The inquiry by the respondents was belated, and non est in the eyes of law. The services of petitioner were dispensed with without due process and without compliance of the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. In these circumstances issues no.1 and 1 (a) are partly decided in the favour of the petitioner.

**Issue No. 2**

17. The petitioner had been working with the respondents from the year 2006 till March, 2013. His services were terminated without following the procedure established by law and in violation of the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. As submitted by learned AR/Counsel for petitioner that he has attained the age of 58 years. In these circumstances the petitioner is held entitled for lump sum compensation of Rs. 2 lakh along-with interest @ 6% from date of illegal termination till recovery of the amount. for non compliance of the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. This issue is decided accordingly.

**Issues No. 3 & 4**

18. The onus of proving these issues was on the respondent. It is argued by learned counsel for the respondents that petitioner was guilty of theft of property of respondent company more than

once and himself absented from work. In these circumstances he was not entitled for the claim put forward by him. Facts to the contrary have appeared from the evidence on record. In these circumstances the petitioner is not concealed any material facts from this court nor he has estopped by his act and conduct to file the present claim. Thus issues no. 3 and 4 are also decided in the favour of the petitioner.

**RELIEF**

19. In view of my discussion on the issues no. 1 to 4 above, the claim petition succeeds and is partly allowed. The petitioner is held entitled for lump sum compensation of Rs. 2 lakhs along-with interest @ 6% for non compliance of the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 by the respondents. Parties are left to bear their costs.

20. The reference is answered in aforesaid terms. A copy of this Award be sent to the appropriate Government for publication in the official gazette. File after due completion be consigned to the Record Room.

Announced in the open Court today, this 26th day of February, 2026.

Sd/-
(PARVEEN CHAUHAN),
*Presiding Judge,*
*Labour Court*-cum-*Industrial Tribunal,*
*Kangra at Dharamshala (H.P.).*

---

**MUNICIPAL COUNCIL MANALI (HIMACHAL PRADESH)**
Phone 01902-252363, Fax – 01902 -252351
Email: -mc1manali@gmail.com web: www.mcmanali.in

*Dated, the 21st May, 2026*

**MCM/Reg.&Control of Dogs/2026/909.—Municipal Council Manali (Registration & Control of Dogs) Bye-Laws, 2026.** In exercise of the powers conferred under the relevant provisions of the Himachal Pradesh Municipal Act, 1994, the Municipal Council Manali hereby frames the following Bye-Laws for registration and control of dogs within the jurisdiction of Municipal Council Manali.

**1. Short Title and Commencement :**

1. These Bye-Laws may be called the Municipal Council Manali (Registration & Control of Dogs) Bye-Laws, 2026.

2. They shall come into force from the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

**2. Definitions :**

In these Bye-Laws, unless the context otherwise requires :—

(a) "Act" means the Himachal Pradesh Municipal Act, 1994 (Act No. 12 of 1994)

(b) "Section" means a section of the Act

(c) "Owner" means the owner of a dog and includes any other person in possession or custody of such dog, whether with or without the consent of the owner.

(d) "Veterinary Public Health Officer" means the Veterinary Officer of the Council or any official authorized to discharge such functions within Municipal Council Manali jurisdiction.

(e) "Dog" means pet dogs and shall not include stray dogs

(f) All expressions used herein but not defined shall have the meanings assigned to them under the Act.

**3. Procedure for Registration of Dogs :**

(i) Every owner of a dog who keeps or brings any dog within the limits of Municipal Council Manali shall, on or before the 1st day of April every year or within seven days of its arrival, register such dog at the office of Municipal Council Manali on payment of :—

- Rs.100/- as one-time registration fee
- Rs.50/- as annual license fee

Provided that the above levy shall not apply to such dogs which are brought within the limits of Municipal Council Manali for show purposes and are not kept within Municipal limits for more than one week.

(ii) The form for registration shall be made available online through the Citizen Seva Portal : Citizen Seva Portal

(iii) After submission of the online application, the owner shall be supplied by the Council with a metal ticket/tag to be attached to the collar around the neck of the dog. The cost of such metal ticket/tag, as determined by the Council from time to time, shall be borne by the applicant.

(iv) The owner shall ensure vaccination of the dog prior to its registration

(v) The registration shall remain valid for a period of twelve months from 1st April to 31st March of the succeeding year.

**4. Duties and Responsibilities of Owners :**

(i) The owner of a pet dog shall be responsible for controlled breeding, immunization, neutering and licensing in accordance with the provisions of these Bye-Laws.

(ii) Any dog not wearing the prescribed metal ticket/tag or not registered in accordance with these Bye-Laws, if found in any public place, may be removed and dealt with under the orders of the Veterinary Public Health Officer, Municipal Council Manali. If not claimed within seven days by the owner, action shall be taken as envisaged under Section 112(a) (ii) of the Act.

(iii) For the purposes of these Bye-Laws, any person in possession or in charge of the dog during the absence of the real owner from the limits of Municipal Council Manali shall be deemed to be the owner of the dog.

(iv) It shall be mandatory for every owner to carry disposable bags while taking the dog on Municipal streets or public places.

(v) No owner or person in charge of a dog shall allow the dog to defecate on any road, street, drain, park, or other public place within Municipal limits. In case any dog is found defecating in such places, it shall be the duty of the owner concerned to immediately clean the excreta and place it in a disposable bag for proper disposal in the prescribed manner. Failure to do so shall render the owner liable for penalty under the relevant sanitation Bye-laws notified by the Municipal Council.

**5. Guidelines for Breeders :**

(i) Every breeder shall be registered with Municipal Council Manali

(ii) The breeder shall maintain complete records regarding :—

- Number of pups born and died from each individual bitch;
- Pedigree details; and
- Vaccination records.

(iii) The breeder shall maintain records of all persons purchasing pups and shall ensure that the purchaser possesses adequate knowledge regarding proper upkeep and care of the pups.

(iv) Every breeder shall pay :—

- Rs.100/- per dog as one-time breeder registration charges; and
- Rs.50/- per dog as annual renewal fee.

The above charges shall be in addition to the registration fee and annual license fee prescribed under Clause 3 (i) of these Bye-Laws.

**6. Penalty :**

(i) Any contravention of these Bye-Laws, including failure to register a dog as provided under Clause 3 above, shall be punishable with a fine of Rs.200/-.

(ii) In case of a continuing breach, an additional fine extending up to Rs.50/- per day may be imposed for the period during which such contravention continues.

Bye Order,
*Executive Officer,*
*Municipal Council Manali.*

ANNEXURE–A

**APPLICATION FORM FOR REGISTRATION OF PET DOG**

1. Name of Owner : _____
2. Father's/Husband's Name : _____
3. Address : _____
4. Mobile Number : _____
5. Aadhar No. (Optional) : _____
6. Breed of Dog : _____
7. Age of Dog : _____
8. Sex of Dog: Male/Female
9. Colour/Identification Marks : _____
10. Vaccination Details : _____
11. Date of Anti-Rabies Vaccination : _____
12. Sterilized/Neutered : Yes/No
13. Upload Photograph of Dog : Yes/No
14. Declaration :

"I, hereby undertake that the information furnished above is true and correct and I shall abide by the provisions of Municipal Council Manali (Registration, Licensing and Control of Pet Dogs) Bye-Laws, 2026."

Date: _____

*Signature of Applicant.*

_____

ANNEXURE–B

**REGISTRATION CERTIFICATE**

**Municipal Council Manali**

District Kullu (H.P.)

Registration No. : _____

License Valid Upto : _____

1. Name of Owner : _____
2. Address : _____
3. Breed of Dog : _____
4. Colour/Identification Marks : _____

5. Vaccination Status : _____

6. Metal Tag No. : _____

This is to certify that the above dog has been registered under Municipal Council Manali (Registration, Licensing and Control of Pet Dogs) Bye-Laws, 2026.

Date : _____

*Signature.*

*Execuitve Officer,*
*Municipal Council Manali.*

_____

ANNEXURE–C

**CONDITIONS OF LICENSE**

1. Dog shall always wear registration tag
2. Dog shall not be allowed to roam freely in public places
3. Owner shall ensure timely vaccination
4. Owner shall clean dog excreta immediately
5. Aggressive dogs shall be muzzled in public places
6. Violation of Bye-Laws may result in cancellation of registration/license.

By order,
*Executive Officer,*
*Municipal Council Manali,*
*District Kullu (H.P.).*

_____

**ब अदालत नायब–तहसीलदार, तहसील नादौन, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0प्र0)**

श्री प्रेम चन्द पुत्र मान सिंह महाल धंगड, मौजा बड़ा, तहसील नादौन, जिला हमीरपुर, हिमाचल प्रदेश

बनाम

आम जनता

श्री प्रेम चन्द पुत्र मान सिंह महाल धंगड, मौजा बड़ा, तहसील नादौन, जिला हमीरपुर, हिमाचल प्रदेश ने दिनांक 11–05–2026 को इस कार्यालय में एक प्रार्थना–पत्र प्रस्तुत किया है जिसमें प्रार्थी ने अनुरोध किया है कि उसका नाम कागजात माल महाल धंगड, मौजा बड़ा, तहसील नादौन, जिला हमीरपुर में प्रेम चन्द पुत्र माहना दर्ज है परन्तु अन्य जगह जैसे कि आधार कार्ड, परिवार नकल आदि में प्रार्थी का नाम प्रेमा पुत्र माहना दर्ज है। प्रार्थी का कहना है कि ये दोनों नाम उसके हैं। प्रार्थी अपना नाम अब दुरुस्त करवाकर कागजात माल महाल धंगड, मौजा बड़ा, तहसील नादौन, जिला हमीरपुर में प्रेम चन्द पुत्र माहना दर्ज करवाना चाहता है।

अतः इस सरकारी गजट द्वारा आम जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उपरोक्त प्रार्थी के नाम दुरुस्त कराने में कोई उजर एवं एतराज है तो वह असालतन या वकालतन तारीख

18–06–2026 को सुबह 10.00 बजे मुकाम तहसील कार्यालय नादौन हाजिर अदालत होकर अपना उजर पेश कर सकता है। तारीख पेशी के बाद किसी किस्म का एतराज काबिले समायत न होगा तथा प्रार्थी के प्रार्थना–पत्र के नाम दुरुस्ती बारे आवश्यक आदेश पारित कर दिए जाएंगे।

यह इश्तहार मोहर अदालत व मेरे हस्ताक्षर से आज दिनांक 16–05–2026 को जारी हुआ।

मोहर। हस्ताक्षरित / –
नायब तहसीलदार,
तहसील नादौन, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0प्र0)।

———————

**ब अदालत नायब तहसीलदार, तहसील नादौन, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0प्र0)**

श्री नवल किशोर डोगरा पुत्र अमृत नयन, महाल कमलाहूं, मौजा वलडूहक, तहसील नादौन, जिला हमीरपुर, हिमाचल प्रदेश

बनाम

आम जनता

श्री नवल किशोर डोगरा पुत्र अमृत नयन महाल कमलाहूं, मौजा वलडूहक, तहसील नादौन, जिला हमीरपुर, हिमाचल प्रदेश ने दिनांक 16–05–2026 को इस कार्यालय में एक प्रार्थना–पत्र प्रस्तुत किया है जिसमें प्रार्थी ने अनुरोध किया है कि उसका नाम कागजात माल महाल कमलाहूं, मौजा वलडूहक, तहसील नादौन, जिला हमीरपुर में नवल किशोर पुत्र अमर नैन उर्फ अमृत नैन दर्ज है परन्तु अन्य जगह जैसा कि आधार कार्ड, परिवार नकल आदि में प्रार्थी का नाम नवल किशोर डोगरा पुत्र अमर नैन उर्फ अमृत नैन दर्ज है। प्रार्थी का कहना है कि ये दोनों नाम उसके हैं। प्रार्थी अपना नाम अब दुरुस्त करवाकर कागजात माल महाल कमलाहूं, मौजा वलडूहक, तहसील नादौन, जिला हमीरपुर में नवल किशोर डोगरा पुत्र अमर नैन उर्फ अमृत नैन दर्ज करवाना चाहता है।

अतः इस सरकारी इश्तहार द्वारा आम जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उपरोक्त प्रार्थी के नाम दुरुस्त करवाने में कोई उजर एवं एतराज है तो वह असालतन या वकालतन तारीख 18–06–2026 को सुबह 10.00 बजे मुकाम तहसील कार्यालय नादौन हाजिर अदालत होकर अपना उजर पेश कर सकता है। तारीख पेशी के बाद किसी किस्म का एतराज काबिले समायत न होगा तथा प्रार्थी के प्रार्थना–पत्र के नाम दुरुस्ती बारे आवश्यक आदेश पारित कर दिए जाएंगे।

यह इश्तहार मोहर अदालत व मेरे हस्ताक्षर से आज दिनांक 16–05–2026 को जारी हुआ।

मोहर। हस्ताक्षरित / –
नायब तहसीलदार,
तहसील नादौन, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0प्र0)।

———————

**ब अदालत तहसीलदार नादौन एवं सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी, तहसील नादौन, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0प्र0)**

आगामी सुनवाई : 15–06–2026

श्री राजेश खन्ना पुत्र जय किशन, गांव वन्टेरा, मौजा कोहला, तहसील नादौन, जिला हमीरपुर, हि0प्र0।

बनाम

आम जनता

विषय.––प्रार्थना–पत्र बराए नाम दरुस्ती बारे।

श्री राजेश खन्ना पुत्र जय किशन, गांव वन्टेरा, मौजा कोहला, तहसील नादौन, जिला हमीरपुर, हि0प्र0 ने दिनांक 14–05–2026 को इस अदालत में एक प्रार्थना–पत्र प्रस्तुत किया है कि उसका नाम कागजात माल टीका वन्टेरा, मौजा कोहला, तहसील नादौन, जिला हमीरपुर में राजेश कुमार दर्ज है परन्तु अन्य जगह उसका नाम राजेश खन्ना दर्ज है। प्रार्थी का कहना है कि ये दोनों नाम उसी के हैं। प्रार्थी अब दुरुस्ती करवाकर कागजात माल टीका वन्टेरा, मौजा कोहला, तहसील नादौन, जिला हमीरपुर में अपना नाम राजेश खन्ना दर्ज करवाना चाहता है।

अतः इस इश्तहार द्वारा आम जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उपरोक्त प्रार्थी के नाम को दुरुस्त करने बारे कोई उजर एवं एतराज हो तो वह असालतन या वकालतन तारीख पेशी 15–06–2026 को दोपहर 2.00 बजे मुकाम नादौन हाजिर अदालत हो कर अपना उजर पेश कर सकता है। हाजिर न आने की सूरत में एकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाकर आगामी कार्यवाही की जाएगी। तारीख पेशी के बाद किसी किस्म का एतराज काबिले समायत न होगा तथा प्रार्थी के प्रार्थना–पत्र पर नाम दुरुस्ती बारे आवश्यक आदेश पारित कर दिये जाएंगे।

ये इश्तहार मोहर अदालत व मेरे हस्ताक्षर से आज दिनांक 16–05–2026 को जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित / –
सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी,
नादौन, जिला हमीरपुर, (हि0प्र0)।

————

**In the Court of Swati Dogra, HPAS Marriage Officer-cum-Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Barsar, District Hamirpur (H.P.)**

In the matter of :

1. Sh. Ashok Kumar s/o Sh. Rattan Chand, r/o Village Kohalwin, P.O. Gahli, Tehsil Nadaun (at present Galore), District Hamirpur (H.P.).

2. Ms. Seema Kumari d/o Sh. Dharam Chand, r/o Village Neri, P.O. Jaure Amb, Tehsil Barsar, District Hamirpur (H.P.) .. *Applicants.*

*Versus*

General Public

*Subject.— Notice for Registration of Marriage.*

Sh. Ashok Kumar and Mrs. Seema Kumari have filed an application u/s 15 & 16 of Special Marriage Act, 1954 alongwith affidavits and supporting documents in the court of undersigned, stating therein that they have solemnized their marriage on 25-04-2026. Therefore, the general public is hereby informed through this notice that if any person having any objection regarding this marriage, may file/her objections personally or in writing before this court on or before

07-06-2026. In case no objection is received by 07-06-2026, it will be presumed that there is no objection to the registration of the above said marriage and the same will be registered accordingly.

Issued under my hand and seal of the court on 07-05-2026.

Seal. Sd/-
*Marriage Officer*-cum-*SDM,*
*Sub-Division Barsar (H.P.).*

---

**In the Court of Swati Dogra,HPAS Marriage Officer-**cum**-Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Barsar, District Hamirpur (H.P.)**

In the matter of :

1. Sh. Pankaj Kumar s/o Sh. Kishori Lal, r/o Village Khalsai, P.O. Jablu, Tehsil Jhandutta, District Bilaspur (H.P.).

2. Ms Mahima Kumari d/o Sh. Desh Raj, r/o Village & P.O. Dahad, Tehsil Jhandutta, District Bilaspur (H.P.) .. *Applicants.*

*Versus*

General Public

*Subject.— Notice for Registration of Marriage.*

Sh. Pankaj Kumar and Mrs. Mahima Kumari have filed an application u/s 15 & 16 of Special Marriage Act, 1954 alongwith affidavits and supporting documents in the court of undersigned, stating therein that they have solemnized their marriage on 02-05-2026. Therefore, the general public is hereby informed through this notice that if any person having any objection regarding this marriage, may file his/her objections personally or in writing before this court on or before 07-06-2026. In case no objection is received by 07-06-2026, It will be presumed that there is no objection to the registration of the above said marriage and the same will be registered accordingly.

Issued under my hand and seal of the court on 07-05-2026.

Seal. Sd/-
*Marriage Officer*-cum-*SDM,*
*Sub-Division Barsar (H.P.).*

---

**In the Court of Swati Dogra,HPAS Marriage Officer-**cum**-Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Barsar, District Hamirpur (H.P.)**

In the matter of :

1. Sh. Sumit Kumar s/o Sh. Hari Chand, r/o Ward No. 5, Village Bal Punder, P.O. Saur, Tehsil Barsar, District Bilaspur (H.P.).

2. Ms. Riya Kami d/o Sh. Ganesh Kumar, r/o Bhulan chowpati, Dalsing Para, Toorsa, T.G. Dalsingpara, Tea Garden, P.O. Dalsingpara, District Jalpaiguri (West Bengal)-735 208

*.. Applicants.*

*Versus*

General Public

*Subject.— Notice of Intended Marriage.*

Sh. Sumit Kumar and Ms. Riya have filed an application u/s 5 of Special Marriage Act, 1954 alongwith affidavits and supporting documents in the court of undersigned in which they have stated that they intend to solemnized their marriage within next three calender months.

Therefore, the general public is hereby informed through this notice that if any person having any objection regarding this marriage, may file his/her objections personally or in writing before this court on or before 15-06-2026. In case no objection is received by 15-06-2026, it will be presumed that there is no objection to the registration of the above said marriage and the same will be registered accordingly.

Issued under my hand and seal of the court on 07-05-2026.

Seal.

Sd/-
*Marriage Officer*-cum-*SDM,*
*Sub-Division Barsar (H.P.).*

---

**In the Court of Executive Magistrate (Naib Tehsildar), Bhoranj, District Hamirpur (H.P.)**

In the matter of :

Smt. Chino Devi d/o Jodhu Ram, Village Bhoti, P.O. Tarkwari, Tehsil Bhoranj, District Hamirpur (H.P.) *. . Applicant.*

*Versus*

General Public *. .Respondent.*

Application u/s 13(3) of Birth and Death Registration Act, 1969 and Section 9 (3) of H.P. Birth and Death Registration Rules, 2003. Whereas, Smt. Chino Devi d/o Jodhu Ram, Village Bhoti, P.O. Tarkwari, Tehsil Bhoranj, District Hamirpur (H.P.) has moved an application before the undersigned under section 13(3) of Birth & Death Registration Act, 1969 and Section 9(3) of H.P. Birth & Death Registration Rules, 2003 alongwith affidavits and other relevant documents for entering Date of Birth 18-03-1958 could not be registered in record of G.P. Bhoranj.

Now, therefore by this proclamation, the general public is hereby informed that any person having any objection(s) for the registration of delayed date of birth of Smt. Chino Devi d/o Jodhu

Ram, may submit their objections in writing or appear in person in this court on or before 02-06-2026 at 10.00 A.M., failing which no objection will be entertained after expiry of date.

Seal. Sd/-

*Executive Magistrate,*
*Bhoranj, District Hamirpur (H.P.).*

---

**In the Court of Executive Magistrate (Naib Tehsildar), Bhoranj, District Hamirpur (H.P.)**

In the matter of :

Smt. Dharmi Devi d/o Bakshi Ram, Village Parol, P.O. Dera Parol, Tehsil Bhoranj, District Hamirpur (H.P.) . . *Applicant.*

*Versus*

General Public . .*Respondent.*

Application u/s 13(3) of Birth and Death Registration Act, 1969 and Section 9 (3) of H.P. Birth and Death Registration Rules, 2003. Whereas, Smt. Dharmi Devi d/o Bakshi Ram, Village Parol, P.O. Dera Parol, Tehsil Bhoranj, District Hamirpur (H.P.) has moved an application before the undersigned under section 13(3) of Birth & Death Registration Act, 1969 and Section 9(3) of H.P. Birth & Death Registration Rules, 2003 alongwith affidavits and other relevant documents for entering Date of Birth 06-03-1965 could not be registered in record of G.P. Keharwin.

Now, therefore by this proclamation, the general public is hereby informed that any person having any objection(s) for the registration of delayed date of birth of Dharmi Devi d/o Bakshi Ram, may submit their objections in writing or appear in person in this court on or before 02-06-2026 at 10.00 A.M., failing which no objection will be entertained after expiry of date.

Seal. Sd/-

*Executive Magistrate,*
*Bhoranj, District Hamirpur (H.P.).*

---

**In the Court of Sh. Sanjeet Singh, HPAS, Marriage Officer -**cum**-Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Hamirpur (H.P.)**

In the matter of :

1. Sh.Vishal s/o Sh. Raj Kumar, r/o Village Ropa, P.O. Aghar, Tehsil & District Hamirpur (H.P.)-176 041.

2. Smt. Khushbu Rani d/o Sh. Balwant Kumar, r/o Village Chalokhar, P.O. Nareli, Tehsil & District Hamirpur (H.P.)-177 020 .. *Applicants.*

*Versus*

General Public

*Subject*.— Notice for Registration of Marriage.

Sh.Vishal and Smt. Khushbu Rani have filed an application u/s 5 of Special Marriage Act, 1954 alongwith supporting affidavits and documents before the Court of undersigned in which they have stated that they intend to solemnize their marriage within next three calendar months.

Therefore, the General Public is hereby informed through this notice that if any person having any objection regarding this marriage, may file his/her objections personally or in writing before this court on or before 22-06-2026. In case no objection is received by 22-06-2026, it will be presumed that there is no objection to the registration of the above said marriage and the same will be registered accordingly.

Issued under my hand and seal of the court on 15-05-2026.

Seal. Sd/-

*Marriage Officer*-cum-*Sub-Divisional Magistrate,*
*Hamirpur (H.P.).*

---

**In the Court of Sh. Sanjeet Singh, HPAS, Marriage Officer -**cum**-Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Hamirpur (H.P.)**

In the matter of :

1. Sh. Karun Kumar s/o Late Sh. Rajinder Kumar, r/o Village Utpur, P.O. Utpur, Tehsil Bamson at Tauni Devi, District Hamirpur (H.P.)-177 022.

2. Smt. Pinky d/o Sh. Siya Ram Paswaan, 1202, Johra Fatak, New Golden Avenue, Amritsar-1, Amritsar, Punjab-143 001 .. *Applicants.*

*Versus*

General Public

*Subject*.— Notice for Registration of Marriage.

Sh. Karun Kumar and Smt. Pinky have filed an application u/s 5 of Special Marriage Act, 1954 alongwith supporting affidavits and documents before the Court of undersigned in which they have stated that they intend to solemnize their marriage within next three calendar months.

Therefore, the General Public is hereby informed through this notice that if any person having any objection regarding this marriage, may file his/her objections personally or in writing before this court on or before 20-06-2026. In case no objection is received by 20-06-2026, it will be presumed that there is no objection to the registration of the above said marriage and the same will be registered accordingly.

Issued under my hand and seal of the court on 14-05-2026.

Seal. Sd/-

*Marriage Officer*-cum-*Sub-Divisional Magistrate,*
*Hamirpur (H.P.).*

**In the Court of Sh. Sanjeet Singh, HPAS, Marriage Officer -cum-Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Hamirpur (H.P.)**

In the matter of :

1. Sh. Saurav Singh s/o Sh. Gurdial Singh, r/o Village Thalamber, P.O. Bherda, Tehsil Bamson at Tauni Devi, District Hamirpur (H.P.).

2. Saniya Rauf d/o Rauf Uddin, r/o 34/250, Khatipada, P.O. Loha Mandi, Tehsil & Distt. Agra (U.P.)-282 002 .. *Applicants.*

*Versus*

General Public

*Subject*.— Notice for Registration of Marriage.

Sh. Saurav Singh and Smt. Saniya Rauf have filed an application u/s 5 of Special Marriage Act, 1954 alongwith supporting affidavits and documents before the Court of undersigned in which they have stated that they intend to solemnize their marriage within next three calendar months.

Therefore, the General Public is hereby informed through this notice that if any person having any objection regarding this marriage, may file his/her objections personally or in writing before this court on or before 20-06-2026. In case no objection is received by 20-06-2026, it will be presumed that there is no objection to the registration of the above said marriage and the same will be registered accordingly.

Issued under my hand and seal of the court on 15-05-2026.

Seal. Sd/-

*Marriage Officer*-cum-*Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Hamirpur (H.P.).*

---

**ब अदालत तहसीलदार नादौन एवं सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी नादौन, तहसील नादौन, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0प्र0)**

आगामी सुनवाई : 15–06–2026

श्री कुलदीप कुमार पुत्र श्री बाल किशन उपनाम रोशन लाल, गांव वदारन, मौजा हथोल, तहसील नादौन, जिला हमीरपुर, हि0प्र0

बनाम

आम जनता

विषय.––प्रार्थना–पत्र बराए नाम दुरुस्ती बारे।

श्री कुलदीप कुमार पुत्र श्री बाल किशन उपनाम रोशन लाल, गांव वदारन, मौजा हथोल, तहसील नादौन, जिला हमीरपुर, हि0प्र0 ने दिनांक 15–05–2026 को इस अदालत में एक प्रार्थना–पत्र प्रस्तुत किया है

कि उसका नाम कागजात माल टीका वदारन, मौजा हथोल, तहसील नादौन, जिला हमीरपुर में कुलदीप दर्ज है परन्तु अन्य जगह उसका नाम कुलदीप कुमार दर्ज है। प्रार्थी का कहना है कि ये दोनों नाम उसी के हैं। प्रार्थी अब दुरुस्ती करवाकर कागजात माल टीका वदारन, मौजा हथोल, तहसील नादौन, जिला हमीरपुर में अपना नाम कुलदीप कुमार दर्ज करवाना चाहता है।

अतः इस इश्तहार द्वारा आम जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उपरोक्त प्रार्थी का नाम दुरुस्त करने बारे कोई उजर एवं एतराज हो तो वह असालतन या वकालतन तारीख पेशी 15–06–2026 को दोपहर 2.00 बजे मुकाम नादौन हाजिर अदालत होकर अपना उजर पेश कर सकता है। हाजिर न आने की सूरत में एकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाकर आगामी कार्यवाही की जाएगी। तारीख पेशी के बाद किसी किस्म का एतराज काबिले समायत न होगा तथा प्रार्थी के प्रार्थना–पत्र पर नाम दुरुस्ती बारे आवश्यक आदेश पारित कर दिये जायेंगे।

यह इश्तहार मोहर अदालत व मेरे हस्ताक्षर से आज दिनांक 15–05–2026 को जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित / –
सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी,
नादौन, जिला हमीरपुर, (हि0प्र0)।

————————

**ब अदालत तहसीलदार एवं सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी, सुजानपुर, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0प्र0)**

| केस नम्बर : | दायर तिथि : | आगामी तारीख पेशी : |
|---|---|---|
| 705947 / 2025/ONLINE | 17–12–2025 | 16–06–2026 |

श्री सुशील मोहन मिसरा पुत्र मोहन मिसरा, निवासी महाल वार्ड नम्बर 9, सुजानपुर, डाकघर व तहसील सुजानपुर, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0प्र0)।

बनाम

आम जनता

विषय.––प्रार्थना–पत्र बराये नाम दुरुस्ती अधीन धारा 37–38 हिमाचल प्रदेश भू–अधिनियम, 1954.

दिनांक 17–12–2025 को प्रार्थी श्री सुशील मोहन मिसरा पुत्र मोहन मिसरा, निवासी महाल वार्ड नम्बर 9, सुजानपुर, डाकघर व तहसील सुजानपुर, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0प्र0) ने अपनी ओर से एक प्रार्थना–पत्र हिमाचल प्रदेश भू–अधिनियम, 1954 की धारा 37–38 के अन्तर्गत प्रस्तुत करके अनुरोध किया है कि उसके पिता का नाम उसके सभी दस्तावेजों में व उनके पिता के मृत्यु प्रमाण–पत्र में मोहन मिसरा दर्ज है। जबकि राजस्व विभाग में उसका नाम अयुध्या दास दर्ज है। जोकि मोहन मिसरा उर्फ अयुध्या दास राजस्व विभाग में दर्ज / दुरुस्त किया जावे।

प्रार्थी के प्रार्थना–पत्र पर कार्यवाही करते हुए आरम्भिक जांच व छानबीन फिल्ड स्टाफ के माध्यम से करवाई गई व स्थानीय टीकादारान के ब्यानात दर्ज करवाए गए, जिसमें पाया गया कि प्रार्थी के पिता को सभी लोग मोहन मिसरा उर्फ अयुध्या दास दोनों नामों से जानते हैं।

इस बारे आम जनता को बजरिया इश्तहार / मुश्त्री मुनादी सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को राजस्व रिकार्ड में प्रार्थी श्री सुशील मोहन मिसरा पुत्र मोहन मिसरा, निवासी महाल वार्ड नम्बर 9, सुजानपुर, डाकघर व तहसील सुजानपुर, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0प्र0) के पिता का नाम राजस्व विभाग में मोहन मिसरा उर्फ अयुध्या दास दर्ज / दुरुस्त किए जाने बारे कोई आपत्ति एवं एतराज हो तो वह असालतन या

वकालतन तारीख पेशी 16–06–2026 को सुबह 11.00 बजे इस अदालत मुकाम सुजानपुर में अपना उजर एवं एतराज पेश कर सकता है कोई आपत्ति एवं एतराज प्राप्त न होने की सूरत में प्रार्थी उपरोक्त का नाम राजस्व रिकार्ड में मोहन मिसरा उर्फ अयुध्या दास दर्ज / दुरुस्त तस्दीक कर दिया जायेगा व इसके उपरांत कोई आपत्ति एवं एतराज मान्य नहीं होगा।

यह इश्तहार / मुश्त्री मुनादी आज दिनांक 13–05–2026 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी हुआ।

मोहर। हस्ताक्षरित / –
तहसीलदार एवं सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी,
सुजानपुर, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0प्र0)।

———————

**In the Court of Executive Magistrate (Tehsildar), Bhoranj,**
**District Hamirpur (H.P.)**

In the matter of :

Smt. Rita Kumari d/o Duni Chand, Village & P.O. Hanoh, Tehsil Bhoranj, District Hamirpur (H.P.) . . *Applicant.*

*Versus*

General Public . .*Respondent.*

Application u/s 13(3) of Birth and Death Registration Act, 1969 and Section 9 (3) of H.P. Birth and Death Registration Rules, 2003, Whereas, Smt. Rita Kumari d/o Duni Chand, Village & P.O. Hanoh, Tehsil Bhoranj, District Hamirpur (H.P.) has moved an application before the undersigned under section 13(3) of Birth & Death Registration Act, 1969 and Section 9(3) of H.P. Birth & Death Registration Rules, 2003 alongwith Affidavits and other relevant documents for entering Date of Birth 23-03-1971 could not be registered in record of G.P. Hanoh.

Now, therefore, by this proclamation, the general public is hereby informed that any person having any objection(s) for the registration of delayed date of birth of Smt. Rita Kumari d/o Duni Chand, may submit their objections in writing or appear in person in this court on or before 04-06-2026 at 10.00 A.M., failing which no objection will be entertained after expiry of date.

Seal. Sd/-
*Executive Magistrate,*
*Bhoranj, District Hamirpur (H.P.).*

———————

**In the Court of Executive Magistrate (Naib Tehsildar), Bhoranj, District Hamirpur (H.P.)**

In the matter of :

Smt. Urmila Devi d/o Haria Ram, Village & P.O. Dhamrol, Tehsil Bhoranj, District Hamirpur (H.P.) . . *Applicant.*

*Versus*

General Public . .*Respondent.*

Application u/s 13(3) of Birth and Death Registration Act, 1969 and Section 9 (3) of H.P. Birth and Death Registration Rules, 2003. Whereas, Smt. Urmila Devi d/o Haria Ram, Village & P.O. Dhamrol, Tehsil Bhoranj, District Hamirpur (H.P.) has moved an application before the undersigned under section 13(3) of Birth & Death Registration Act, 1969 and Section 9(3) of H.P. Birth & Death Registration Rules, 2003 alongwith Affidavits and other relevant documents for entering Date of Birth 27-05-1969 could not be registered in record of G.P. Dhamrol.

Now, therefore, by this proclamation, the general public is hereby informed that any person having any objection(s) for the registration of delayed date of birth of Smt. Urmila Devi d/o Haria Ram, may submit their objections in writing or appear in person in this court on or before 02-06-2026 at 10.00 A.M., failing which no objection will be entertained after expiry of date.

Seal. Sd/-

*Executive Magistrate,*
*Bhoranj, District Hamirpur (H.P.).*

---

**In the Court of Executive Magistrate (Naib Tehsildar), Bhoranj, District Hamirpur (H.P.)**

In the matter of :

Smt. Amrati Devi d/o Bhagi Rath, Village Sammu, P.O. Tarkwari, Tehsil Bhoranj, District Hamirpur (H.P.) . . *Applicant.*

*Versus*

General Public . .*Respondent.*

Application u/s 13(3) of Birth and Death Registration Act, 1969 and Section 9 (3) of H.P. Birth and Death Registration Rules, 2003. Whereas, Smt. Amrati Devi d/o Bhagi Rath, Village Sammu, P.O. Tarkwari, Tehsil Bhoranj, District Hamirpur (H.P.) has moved an application before the undersigned under section 13(3) of Birth & Death Registration Act, 1969 and Section 9(3) of H.P. Birth & Death Registration Rules, 2003 alongwith Affidavits and other relevant documents for entering Date of Birth 04-01-1965 could not be registered in record of G.P. Bhoranj.

Now, therefore by this proclamation, the general public is hereby informed that any person having any objection(s) for the registration of delayed date of birth of Amrati Devi d/o Bhagi Rath, may submit their objections in writing or appear in person in this court on or before 04-06-2026 at 10.00 A.M., failing which no objection will be entertained after expiry of date.

Seal. Sd/-

*Executive Magistrate,*
*Bhoranj, District Hamirpur (H.P.).*

**In the Court of Executive Magistrate (Naib Tehsildar), Bhoranj, District Hamirpur (H.P.)**

In the matter of :

Smt. Saroj Kumari d/o Dalip Singh, Village Kalehri, P.O. Baroh, Tehsil Bhoranj, District Hamirpur (H.P.) . . *Applicant.*

*Versus*

General Public . .*Respondent.*

Application u/s 13(3) of Birth and Death Registration Act, 1969 and Section 9 (3) of H.P. Birth and Death Registration Rules, 2003. Whereas, Smt. Saroj Kumari d/o Dalip Singh, Village Kalehri, P.O. Baroh, Tehsil Bhoranj, District Hamirpur (H.P.) has moved an application before the undersigned under section 13(3) of Birth & Death Registration Act, 1969 and Section 9(3) of H.P. Birth & Death Registration Rules, 2003 alongwith Affidavits and other relevant documents for entering Date of Birth 01-01-1975 could not be registered in record of G.P. Dadu.

Now, therefore, by this proclamation, the general public is hereby informed that any person having any objection(s) for the registration of delayed date of birth of Saroj Kumari d/o Dalip Singh, may submit their objections in writing or appear in person in this court on or before 02-06-2026 at 10.00 A.M., failing which no objection will be entertained after expiry of date.

Seal. Sd/-

*Executive Magistrate,*
*Bhoranj, District Hamirpur (H.P.).*

---

**In the Court of Sh. Sanjeet Singh, HPAS, Marriage Officer-**cum**-Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Hamirpur (H.P.)**

In the matter of :

1. Sh. Ajay Kumar s/o Sh. Rattan Chand, r/o Ward No. 2, Village Anu Kalan, Post Office Hamirpur (H.P.)-Pin Code 177 001.

2. Smt. Anjana Kumari d/o Sh. Jagdish Chand, r/o Village Bhadrol, Post Office Bhadrol, Tehsil dheera, District Kangra (H.P.)-Pin Code 176 101 . . *Applicants.*

*Versus*

General Public

*Subject.*— Notice for Registration of Marriage.

Sh. Ajay Kumar s/o Smt. Anjana Kumari have filed an application u/s 5 of Special Marriages Act, 1954 alongwith supporting affidavits and documents before the Court of

undersigned in which they have stated that they intend to solemnize their marriage within next three calendar months.

Therefore, the general public is hereby informed through this notice that if any person having any objections regarding this marriage may file his/her objections personally or in writing before this court on or before 20-06-2026. In case no objection is received by 20-06-2026, it will be presumed that there is no objection to the registration of the above said marriage and the same will be registered accordingly.

Issued under my hand and seal of the court on 14-05-2026.

Seal. Sd/-
*Marriage Officer*-cum-*SDM,*
*Sub-Division, Hamirpur (H.P.).*

---

**ब अदालत तहसीलदार एवं सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी, खुण्डियां, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)**

मुकद्दमा नं0 : 814479 / 2026 तारीख पेशी : 26–05–2026 किस्म मुकद्दमा : दुरुस्ती नाम

श्री धर्म सिंह राणा पुत्र श्री शेर सिंह राणा, निवासी महाल टिप बूहला, मौजा गन्धवाड, तहसील खुण्डियां, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0) प्रार्थी।

बनाम

आम जनता प्रतिवादी।

विषय.––प्रार्थना–पत्र दुरुस्ती नाम राजस्व अभिलेख महाल टिप बूहला, मौजा गन्धवाड, तहसील खुण्डियां, जिला कांगड़ा, हि0प्र0।

प्रार्थी श्री धर्म सिंह राणा पुत्र श्री शेर सिंह राणा, निवासी महाल टिप बूहला, मौजा गन्धवाड, तहसील खुण्डियां, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0) ने एक प्रार्थना–पत्र मय शपथ–पत्र पीठासीन अधिकारी के समक्ष प्रस्तुत करते हुए अनुरोध किया है कि उसका नाम पंचायत अभिलेख व अन्य दस्तावेज में धर्म सिंह राणा व पिता का नाम शेर सिंह राणा दर्ज है व उसका विख्यात व सही नाम भी धर्म सिंह राणा व पिता का नाम शेर सिंह राणा ही है। परन्तु राजस्व अभिलेख पटवार वृत्त टिप के महाल टिप बूहला में उसका नाम धर्म सिंह व पिता का नाम शेरू गलत दर्ज हो गया है। अतः प्रार्थी अब अपने व अपने पिता के नाम की राजस्व अभिलेख महाल टिप बूहला में दुरुस्ती करवा करके धर्म सिंह के बजाये धर्म सिंह राणा उपनाम धर्म सिंह व पिता के नाम की दुरुस्ती करवाकर शेरू के बजाये शेर सिंह राणा उपनाम शेरू दर्ज करवाना चाहता है।

अतः प्रार्थी का आवेदन स्वीकार करते हुए इस मुश्त्री / मुनादी चस्पांगी के माध्यम से आम जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उक्त प्रार्थी के नाम की राजस्व अभिलेख महाल टिप वूहला में दुरुस्ती करवा करके धर्म सिंह के बजाये धर्म सिंह राणा उपनाम धर्म सिंह व पिता के नाम शेर सिंह राणा उपनाम शेरू दर्ज करवाने बारे किसी किस्म की आपत्ति या उजर हो ता वो तारीख पेशी 26–05–2026 को असालतन या वकालतन हाजिर अदालत होकर अपना उजर पेश कर सकता है। अन्यथा बाद तारीख पेशी किसी किस्म का उजर एवं एतराज नहीं सुना जावेगा व नाम दुरुस्ती का आदेश पारित कर दिया जाएगा।

यइ इश्तहार आज दिनांक 12–05–2026 को मोहर अदालत व मेरे हस्ताक्षर से जारी हुआ।

मोहर। हस्ताक्षरित / –
सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी,
तहसील खुण्डियां, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0 प्र0)।

**ब अदालत / कार्यालय नायब तहसीलदार एवं सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी,**
**तहसील ज्वालामुखी, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)**

क्रमांक : 481 / Teh / ओ.के. / JMKL दिनांक : 13–05–2026

विषय.––इन्तकाल नम्बर 979, वरासत बरूए वसीयत क्रमांक 213 / 2020, दिनांक 14–02–2020 सब–रजिस्ट्रार देहरा, तारीख मृत्यु 15–07–2020 वाक्या महाल देवीताल, मौजा द्रंग, हरबस्त नं0 389 / 3, तहसील ज्वालामुखी, जिला कांगड़ा, हि0प्र0 तारीख दर्ज इन्तकाल 22–10–2024 ममता चेली शबनम चेली सोहणी बनाम गुड्डी उपनाम नीलम शर्मा चेली, ममता चेली, शबनम चेली जोकि ता हाल फैसला हेतु लम्बित है का इन्तकाल फैसला के सन्दर्भ में।

एतद्ज्ञापन / इश्तहार / प्रकाशन द्वारा आम जनता व खास को सूचित किया जाता है कि उपरोक्त विषय में महाल देवीताल, मौजा द्रंग, तहसील ज्वालामुखी, जिला कांगड़ा, हि0प्र0 मलकीयती खेबट नं0 315, जमाबन्दी वर्ष 2019–20, कित्ता 7, रकबा तादादी 152–90 वर्ग मीटर, ममता चेली शवनम चेली, सोहणी तृतीय लिंग (Transgender)½ भाग की मालिक है जोकि दिनांक 15–07–2020 को फौत होने की सूरत में बरूए वसीयत क्रमांक 213 / 2020 दिनांक 14–02–2020 सव रजिस्ट्रार देहरा के अनुसार इन्तकाल नं. 979 वरास्त वरुए वसीयत दिनांक 22–11–2024 को दर्ज जिल्द इन्तकाल है। जोकि ता हाल फैसला लम्बित / बकाया है। जिसका इन्तकाल वरास्त किया जाना अपेक्षित है अतः इसमें आम व खास जनता या हितबद्ध वारिसों / वशिन्दगान देह के हितों को ध्यान में रखते हुए इस अखबारी ज्ञापन / इश्तहार प्रकाशन द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि इस जायदाद इन्तकाल उपरोक्त का फैसला ममता चेली बनाम गुड्डी उपनाम नीलम शर्मा चेली के नाम मन्जूर करने बारे किसी को कोई उजर / एतराज हो तो वह असालतन या वकालतन इस उजर को दिनांक 15–06–2026 को सुबह 11.00 बजे से पहले तक अधोहस्ताक्षरी के कार्यालय में उजर व एतराज लिखित रूप में दे सकता है। दिनांक 15–06–2026 को सुबह 11.00 बजे तक कोई उजर / एतराज प्राप्त न होने की सूरत में यह समझाया जायेगा कि उपरोक्त विषय में किसी को कोई उजर / एतराज नहीं है व उपरोक्त इन्तकाल का फैसला दिनांक 15–06–2026 को 11.00 बजे सुबह के बाद ममता चेली बनाम गुड्डी उपनाम नीलम शर्मा चेली के नाम मन्जूर कर दिया जाएगा। वरास्त मंजूर होने की सूरत में गुड्डी उपनाम नीलम शर्मा चेली उपरोक्त गैर कृषक ही रहेगी।

आज दिनांक 12–05–2026 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत सहित जारी हुआ।

मोहर। हस्ताक्षरित / –
नायब तहसीलदार एवं सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी,
तहसील ज्वालामुखी, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)।

————

**In the Court of Assistant Collector-**cum**-Naib Tehsildar, Jawalamukhi,**
**Distt. Kangra (H.P.)**

Case No. : 814230/2026 Date of Hearing : 18-06-2026

In the matter of :

Rajinder Kaundal s/o Sh. Jagdish Chandar, r/o Mohal Bhati, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.) *..Applicant.*

*Versus*

General Public *..Respondent.*

Application for Correction of Name Under Section 37(2) of Land Revenue Act, 1954.

NOTICE

Whereas, Rajinder Kaundal s/o Sh. Jagdish Chandar, r/o Mohal Bhati, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.) has submitted an application under Section 37(2) of the Land Revenue Act, 1954 alongwith all supportive documents such as affidavit, Aadhar Card, 10th Marksheet, Ration Card, Jamabandi Parcha, and Parivar Nakal in the court of undersigned.

Wherein he stated that, he belongs to above mentioned address. His name is written as Rajinder in the land/revenue record of Mohal Bhati, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, which is wrong. His original/correct name is "Rajinder Kaundal". Therefore, he requests to correct his name as "Rajinder Kaundal" instead of Rajinder in the revenue record of Mohal Bhati, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, as per supportive documents enclosed by him with the application file.

Therefore, through this proclamation in Gazette/leading Newspaper, the general public is hereby informed that if any person having any objection for entry of correction in name of applicant mentioned above, may submit his/her objection in writing to this court before 18-06-2026. No objection will be entertained after prescribed period and application will be decided accordingly.

Given under my hand and seal of the Court.

Seal. Sd/-
*Assistant Collector*-cum-*Naib Tehsildar,*
*Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.).*

---

**In the Court of Assistant Collector-cum-Naib Tehsildar, Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.)**

**Case No**. : 814243/2026 Date of Hearing : 18-06-2026

In the matter of :

Rajender Singh s/o Sh. Ishwar Dass, r/o Mohal Hatli, P.O. Gummer, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.) ..*Applicant.*

*Versus*

General Public ..*Respondent.*

Application for Correction of Name Under Section 37(2) of Land Revenue Act, 1954.

NOTICE

Whereas, Rajinder Singh s/o Sh. Ishwar Dass, r/o Mohal Hatli, P.O. Gummer, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.) has submitted an application under Section 37(2) of the Land Revenue Act, 1954 alongwith all supportive documents such as affidavit, Aadhar Card, 10th Marksheet, Ration Card, Jamabandi Parcha, and Parivar Nakal in the court of undersigned.

Wherein he stated that, he belongs to above mentioned address. His name is written as Rajinder Kumar in the land/revenue record of Mohal Hatli, Mouza Gummer, Tehsil Jawalamukhi

which is wrong. His original/correct name is "Rajender Singh". Therefore, he requests to correct his name as "Rajender Singh" instead of Rajinder Kumar in the revenue record of Mohal Hatli, Mouza Gummer, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, as per supportive documents enclosed by him with the application file.

Therefore, through this proclamation in Gazette/leading Newspaper, the general public is hereby informed that if any person having any objection for entry of correction in name of applicant mentioned above, may submit his/her objection in writing to this court before 18-06-2026. No objection will be entertained after prescribed period and application will be decided accordingly.

Given under my hand and seal of the Court.

Seal. Sd/-

*Assistant Collector 2nd Grade,*
*Tehsil Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.).*

---

**In the Court of Assistant Collector-**cum**-Naib Tehsildar, Jawalamukhi,**
**Distt. Kangra (H.P.)**

Case No. : 814242/2026 Date of Hearing : 23-06-2026

In the matter of :

Joginder Singh s/o Sh. Roshan Lal, r/o Mohal Saletar, Mouza Amb, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.) ..*Applicant.*

*Versus*

General Public ..*Respondent.*

Application for Correction of Name Under Section 37(2) of Land Revenue Act, 1954.

NOTICE

Whereas, Joginder Singh s/o Sh. Roshan Lal, r/o Mohal Saletar, Mouza Amb, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.) has submitted an application under Section 37(2) of the Land Revenue Act, 1954 alongwith all supportive documents such as affidavit, Aadhar Card, PAN Card, Ration Card, Jamabandi Parcha, and Parivar Nakal in the court of undersigned.

Wherein he stated that, he belongs to above mentioned address. His name is written as Joginder Kumar in the land/revenue record of Mohal Saletar, Mouza Amb, which is wrong. His original/correct name is "Joginder Singh". Therefore, he requests to correct his name as "Joginder Singh" instead of Joginder Kumar in the revenue record of Mohal Saletar, Mouza Amb, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, as per supportive documents enclosed by him with the application file.

Therefore, through this proclamation in Gazette/leading Newspaper, the general public is hereby informed that if any person having any objection for entry of correction in name of applicant mentioned above, may submit his/her objection in writing to this court before

23-06-2026. No objection will be entertained after prescribed period and application will be decided accordingly.

Given under my hand and seal of the Court.

Seal. Sd/-
*Assistant Collector 2nd Grade,*
*Tehsil Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.).*

---

**In the Court of Assistant Collector-**cum**-Naib Tehsildar, Jawalamukhi,**
**Distt. Kangra (H.P.)**

Case No. : 814257/2026 Date of Hearing : 18-06-2026

In the matter of :

Braham Dass s/o Sh. Khushi Ram, r/o Mohal Doli, Mouza Amb, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.) ..*Applicant.*

*Versus*

General Public ..*Respondent.*

Application for Correction of Name Under Section 37(2) of Land Revenue Act, 1954.

NOTICE

Whereas, Braham Dass s/o Sh. Khushi Ram, r/o Mohal Doli, Mouza Amb, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.) has submitted an application under Section 37(2) of the Land Revenue Act, 1954 alongwith all supportive documents such as affidavit, Aadhar Card, School Leaving Certificate, Jamabandi Parcha, and Parivar Nakal in the court of undersigned.

Wherein, he stated that, he belongs to above mentioned address. His name is written as Brahmu in the land/revenue record of Mohal Doli, Mouza Amb, which is wrong. His original/correct name is “Braham Dass”. Therefore, he requests to correct his name as “Braham Dass” instead of Brahmu in the revenue record of Mohal Doli, Mouza Amb, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, as per supportive documents enclosed by him with the application file.

Therefore, through this proclamation in Gazette/leading Newspaper, the general public is hereby informed that if any person having any objection for entry of correction in name of applicant mentioned above, may submit his/her objection in writing to this court before 18-06-2026. No objection will be entertained after prescribed period and application will be decided accordingly.

Given under my hand and seal of the Court.

Seal. Sd/-
*Assistant Collector 2nd Grade,*
*Tehsil Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.).*

**In the Court of Executive Magistrate-**cum**-Naib Tehsildar, Tehsil Office, Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.)**

In the matter of :

Anita d/o Sh. Punjab Singh, r/o Village Amb Doli, P.O. Amb Pathiar, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.) ..*Applicant.*

*Versus*

General Public ..*Respondent.*

"Application under Section 13(3) of the Himachal Pradesh Registration of Births and Deaths Act, 1969 for the registration of date of birth."

NOTICE

Whereas, Applicant Anita d/o Sh. Punjab Singh, r/o Village Amb Doli, P.O. Amb Pathiar, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.) personally appeared before the undersigned and submitted an application stating that her date of birth is 12-10-1988. However, due to inadvertence and lack of awareness, it was not recorded in the official records of the local Gram Panchayat Amb Pathiar. Therefore, it is necessary to have it entered in the Birth records of Gram Panchayat Amb Pathiar.

Accordingly, the general public is hereby informed through this notice and proclamation that if anyone has any objection in this regard, they may appear personally or through counsel on 18-06-2026 and register their objection. After this date, no objection will be entertained, and orders will be passed to record the date of birth of Anita d/o Sh. Punjab Singh, r/o Village Amb Doli, P.O. Amb Pathiar, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.), as 12-10-1988 in the records of G.P. Amb Pathiar unde section 13(3) of the Registration of Births and Deaths Act, 1969.

Issued today on dated 05-05-2026, under my signature and the seal of the court.

Seal. Sd/-

*Executive Magistrate*-cum-*Naib Tehsildar,*
*Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.).*

---

**In the Court of Assistant Collector-cum-Naib Tehsildar, Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.)**

**Case No. : 814230/2026** **Date of Hearing :** 18-06-2026

In the matter of :

Rajinder Kaundal s/o Sh. Jagdish Chandar, r/o Mohal Bhati, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.) ..*Applicant.*

*Versus*

General Public ..*Respondent.*

Application for Correction of Name Under Section 37(2) of Land Revenue Act, 1954.

NOTICE

Whereas, Rajinder Kaundal s/o Sh. Jagdish Chandar, r/o Mohal Bhati, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.) has submitted an application under Section 37(2) of the Land Revenue Act, 1954 alongwith all supportive documents such as affidavit, Aadhar Card, 10th Marksheet, Ration Card, Jamabandi Parcha, and Parivar Nakal in the court of undersigned.

Wherein he stated that, he belongs to above mentioned address. His name is written as Rajinder in the land/revenue record of Mohal Bhati, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, which is wrong. His original/correct name is "Rajinder Kaundal". Therefore, he requests to correct his name as "Rajinder Kaundal" instead of Rajinder in the revenue record of Mohal Bhati, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, as per supportive documents enclosed by him with the application file.

Therefore, through this proclamation in Gazette/leading Newspaper, the general public is hereby informed that if any person having any objection for entry of correction in name of applicant mentioned above, may submit his/her objection in writing to this court before 18-06-2026. No objection will be entertained after prescribed period and application will be decided accordingly.

Given under my hand and seal of the Court.

Seal. Sd/-

*Assistant Collector*-cum-*Naib Tehsildar,*
*Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.).*

---

**In the Court of Assistant Collector-cum-Naib Tehsildar, Jawalamukhi,**
**Distt. Kangra (H.P.)**

Case No. : 814243/2026 Date of Hearing : 18-06-2026

In the matter of :

Rajender Singh s/o Sh. Ishwar Dass, r/o Mohal Hatli, P.O. Gummer, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.) ..*Applicant.*

*Versus*

General Public ..*Respondent.*

Application for Correction of Name Under Section 37(2) of Land Revenue Act, 1954.

NOTICE

Whereas, Rajinder Singh s/o Sh. Ishwar Dass, r/o Mohal Hatli, P.O. Gummer, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.) has submitted an application under Section 37(2) of the Land Revenue Act, 1954 alongwith all supportive documents such as affidavit, Aadhar Card, 10th Marksheet, Ration Card, Jamabandi Parcha, and Parivar Nakal in the court of undersigned.

Wherein he stated that, he belongs to above mentioned address. His name is written as Rajinder Kumar in the land/revenue record of Mohal Hatli, Mouza Gummer, Tehsil Jawalamukhi

which is wrong. His original/correct name is "Rajender Singh". Therefore, he requests to correct his name as "Rajender Singh" instead of Rajinder Kumar in the revenue record of Mohal Hatli, Mouza Gummer, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, as per supportive documents enclosed by him with the application file.

Therefore, through this proclamation in Gazette/leading Newspaper, the general public is hereby informed that if any person having any objection for entry of correction in name of applicant mentioned above, may submit his/her objection in writing to this court before 18-06-2026. No objection will be entertained after prescribed period and application will be decided accordingly.

Given under my hand and seal of the Court.

Seal. Sd/-

*Assistant Collector 2nd Grade,*
*Tehsil Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.).*

---

**In the Court of Assistant Collector-**cum**-Naib Tehsildar, Jawalamukhi,**
**Distt. Kangra (H.P.)**

Case No. : 814242/2026 Date of Hearing : 23-06-2026

In the matter of :

Joginder Singh s/o Sh. Roshan Lal, r/o Mohal Saletar, Mouza Amb, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.) ..*Applicant.*

*Versus*

General Public ..*Respondent.*

Application for Correction of Name Under Section 37(2) of Land Revenue Act, 1954.

NOTICE

Whereas, Joginder Singh s/o Sh. Roshan Lal, r/o Mohal Saletar, Mouza Amb, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.) has submitted an application under Section 37(2) of the Land Revenue Act, 1954 alongwith all supportive documents such as affidavit, Aadhar Card, PAN Card, Ration Card, Jamabandi Parcha, and Parivar Nakal in the court of undersigned.

Wherein he stated that, he belongs to above mentioned address. His name is written as Joginder Kumar in the land/revenue record of Mohal Saletar, Mouza Amb, which is wrong. His original/correct name is "Joginder Singh". Therefore, he requests to correct his name as "Joginder Singh" instead of Joginder Kumar in the revenue record of Mohal Saletar, Mouza Amb, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, as per supportive documents enclosed by him with the application file.

Therefore, through this proclamation in Gazette/leading Newspaper, the general public is hereby informed that if any person having any objection for entry of correction in name of applicant mentioned above, may submit his/her objection in writing to this court before

23-06-2026. No objection will be entertained after prescribed period and application will be decided accordingly.

Given under my hand and seal of the Court.

Seal. Sd/-
*Assistant Collector 2nd Grade,*
*Tehsil Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.).*

---

**In the Court of Assistant Collector-**cum**-Naib Tehsildar, Jawalamukhi,**
**Distt. Kangra (H.P.)**

Case No. : 814257/2026 Date of Hearing : 18-06-2026

In the matter of :

Braham Dass s/o Sh. Khushi Ram, r/o Mohal Doli, Mouza Amb, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.) ..*Applicant.*

*Versus*

General Public ..*Respondent.*

Application for Correction of Name Under Section 37(2) of Land Revenue Act, 1954.

NOTICE

Whereas, Braham Dass s/o Sh. Khushi Ram, r/o Mohal Doli, Mouza Amb, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.) has submitted an application under Section 37(2) of the Land Revenue Act, 1954 alongwith all supportive documents such as affidavit, Aadhar Card, School Leaving Certificate, Jamabandi Parcha, and Parivar Nakal in the court of undersigned.

Wherein, he stated that, he belongs to above mentioned address. His name is written as Brahmu in the land/revenue record of Mohal Doli, Mouza Amb, which is wrong. His original/correct name is “Braham Dass”. Therefore, he requests to correct his name as “Braham Dass” instead of Brahmu in the revenue record of Mohal Doli, Mouza Amb, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, as per supportive documents enclosed by him with the application file.

Therefore, through this proclamation in Gazette/leading Newspaper, the general public is hereby informed that if any person having any objection for entry of correction in name of applicant mentioned above, may submit his/her objection in writing to this court before 18-06-2026. No objection will be entertained after prescribed period and application will be decided accordingly.

Given under my hand and seal of the Court.

Seal. Sd/-
*Assistant Collector 2nd Grade,*
*Tehsil Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.).*

**In the Court of Executive Magistrate-**cum**-Naib Tehsildar, Tehsil Office, Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.)**

In the matter of :

Anita d/o Sh. Punjab Singh, r/o Village Amb Doli, P.O. Amb Pathiar, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.) ..*Applicant.*

*Versus*

General Public ..*Respondent.*

"Application under Section 13(3) of the Himachal Pradesh Registration of Births and Deaths Act, 1969 for the registration of date of birth."

NOTICE

Whereas, Applicant Anita d/o Sh. Punjab Singh, r/o Village Amb Doli, P.O. Amb Pathiar, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.) personally appeared before the undersigned and submitted an application stating that her date of birth is 12-10-1988. However, due to inadvertence and lack of awareness, it was not recorded in the official records of the local Gram Panchayat Amb Pathiar. Therefore, it is necessary to have it entered in the Birth records of Gram Panchayat Amb Pathiar.

Accordingly, the general public is hereby informed through this notice and proclamation that if anyone has any objection in this regard, they may appear personally or through counsel on 18-06-2026 and register their objection. After this date, no objection will be entertained, and orders will be passed to record the date of birth of Anita d/o Sh. Punjab Singh, r/o Village Amb Doli, P.O. Amb Pathiar, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.), as 12-10-1988 in the records of G.P. Amb Pathiar unde section 13(3) of the Registration of Births and Deaths Act, 1969.

Issued today on dated 05-05-2026, under my signature and the seal of the court.

Seal. Sd/-

*Executive Magistrate*-cum-*Naib Tehsildar,*
*Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.).*

---

**In the Court of Assistant Collector-cum-Naib Tehsildar, Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.)**

Case No. : 814230/2026 Date of Hearing : 18-06-2026

In the matter of :

Rajinder Kaundal s/o Sh. Jagdish Chandar, r/o Mohal Bhati, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.) ..*Applicant.*

*Versus*

General Public ..*Respondent.*

Application for Correction of Name Under Section 37(2) of Land Revenue Act, 1954.

NOTICE

Whereas, Rajinder Kaundal s/o Sh. Jagdish Chandar, r/o Mohal Bhati, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.) has submitted an application under Section 37(2) of the Land Revenue Act, 1954 alongwith all supportive documents such as affidavit, Aadhar Card, 10th Marksheet, Ration Card, Jamabandi Parcha, and Parivar Nakal in the court of undersigned.

Wherein he stated that, he belongs to above mentioned address. His name is written as Rajinder in the land/revenue record of Mohal Bhati, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, which is wrong. His original/correct name is "Rajinder Kaundal". Therefore, he requests to correct his name as "Rajinder Kaundal" instead of Rajinder in the revenue record of Mohal Bhati, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, as per supportive documents enclosed by him with the application file.

Therefore, through this proclamation in Gazette/leading Newspaper, the general public is hereby informed that if any person having any objection for entry of correction in name of applicant mentioned above, may submit his/her objection in writing to this court before 18-06-2026. No objection will be entertained after prescribed period and application will be decided accordingly.

Given under my hand and seal of the Court.

Seal. Sd/-
*Assistant Collector*-cum-*Naib Tehsildar,*
*Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.).*

---

**In the Court of Assistant Collector-cum-Naib Tehsildar, Jawalamukhi,**
**Distt. Kangra (H.P.)**

Case No. : 814243/2026 Date of Hearing : 18-06-2026

In the matter of :

Rajender Singh s/o Sh. Ishwar Dass, r/o Mohal Hatli, P.O. Gummer, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.) ..*Applicant.*

*Versus*

General Public ..*Respondent.*

Application for Correction of Name Under Section 37(2) of Land Revenue Act, 1954.

NOTICE

Whereas, Rajinder Singh s/o Sh. Ishwar Dass, r/o Mohal Hatli, P.O. Gummer, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.) has submitted an application under Section 37(2) of the Land Revenue Act, 1954 alongwith all supportive documents such as affidavit, Aadhar Card, 10th Marksheet, Ration Card, Jamabandi Parcha, and Parivar Nakal in the court of undersigned.

Wherein he stated that, he belongs to above mentioned address. His name is written as Rajinder Kumar in the land/revenue record of Mohal Hatli, Mouza Gummer, Tehsil Jawalamukhi

which is wrong. His original/correct name is "Rajender Singh". Therefore, he requests to correct his name as "Rajender Singh" instead of Rajinder Kumar in the revenue record of Mohal Hatli, Mouza Gummer, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, as per supportive documents enclosed by him with the application file.

Therefore, through this proclamation in Gazette/leading Newspaper, the general public is hereby informed that if any person having any objection for entry of correction in name of applicant mentioned above, may submit his/her objection in writing to this court before 18-06-2026. No objection will be entertained after prescribed period and application will be decided accordingly.

Given under my hand and seal of the Court.

Seal. Sd/-

*Assistant Collector 2nd Grade,*
*Tehsil Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.).*

---

**In the Court of Assistant Collector-**cum**-Naib Tehsildar, Jawalamukhi,**
**Distt. Kangra (H.P.)**

Case No. : 814242/2026 Date of Hearing : 23-06-2026

In the matter of :

Joginder Singh s/o Sh. Roshan Lal, r/o Mohal Saletar, Mouza Amb, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.) ..*Applicant.*

*Versus*

General Public ..*Respondent.*

Application for Correction of Name Under Section 37(2) of Land Revenue Act, 1954.

NOTICE

Whereas, Joginder Singh s/o Sh. Roshan Lal, r/o Mohal Saletar, Mouza Amb, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.) has submitted an application under Section 37(2) of the Land Revenue Act, 1954 alongwith all supportive documents such as affidavit, Aadhar Card, PAN Card, Ration Card, Jamabandi Parcha, and Parivar Nakal in the court of undersigned.

Wherein he stated that, he belongs to above mentioned address. His name is written as Joginder Kumar in the land/revenue record of Mohal Saletar, Mouza Amb, which is wrong. His original/correct name is "Joginder Singh". Therefore, he requests to correct his name as "Joginder Singh" instead of Joginder Kumar in the revenue record of Mohal Saletar, Mouza Amb, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, as per supportive documents enclosed by him with the application file.

Therefore, through this proclamation in Gazette/leading Newspaper, the general public is hereby informed that if any person having any objection for entry of correction in name of applicant mentioned above, may submit his/her objection in writing to this court before

23-06-2026. No objection will be entertained after prescribed period and application will be decided accordingly.

Given under my hand and seal of the Court.

Seal. Sd/-
*Assistant Collector 2nd Grade,*
*Tehsil Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.).*

---

**In the Court of Assistant Collector-**cum**-Naib Tehsildar, Jawalamukhi,**
**Distt. Kangra (H.P.)**

Case No. : 814257/2026 Date of Hearing : 18-06-2026

In the matter of :

Braham Dass s/o Sh. Khushi Ram, r/o Mohal Doli, Mouza Amb, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.) ..*Applicant.*

*Versus*

General Public ..*Respondent.*

Application for Correction of Name Under Section 37(2) of Land Revenue Act, 1954.

NOTICE

Whereas, Braham Dass s/o Sh. Khushi Ram, r/o Mohal Doli, Mouza Amb, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.) has submitted an application under Section 37(2) of the Land Revenue Act, 1954 alongwith all supportive documents such as affidavit, Aadhar Card, School Leaving Certificate, Jamabandi Parcha, and Parivar Nakal in the court of undersigned.

Wherein, he stated that, he belongs to above mentioned address. His name is written as Brahmu in the land/revenue record of Mohal Doli, Mouza Amb, which is wrong. His original/correct name is “Braham Dass”. Therefore, he requests to correct his name as “Braham Dass” instead of Brahmu in the revenue record of Mohal Doli, Mouza Amb, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, as per supportive documents enclosed by him with the application file.

Therefore, through this proclamation in Gazette/leading Newspaper, the general public is hereby informed that if any person having any objection for entry of correction in name of applicant mentioned above, may submit his/her objection in writing to this court before 18-06-2026. No objection will be entertained after prescribed period and application will be decided accordingly.

Given under my hand and seal of the Court.

Seal. Sd/-
*Assistant Collector 2nd Grade,*
*Tehsil Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.).*

**In the Court of Executive Magistrate-**cum**-Naib Tehsildar, Tehsil Office, Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.)**

In the matter of :

Anita d/o Sh. Punjab Singh, r/o Village Amb Doli, P.O. Amb Pathiar, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.) ..*Applicant.*

*Versus*

General Public ..*Respondent.*

"Application under Section 13(3) of the Himachal Pradesh Registration of Births and Deaths Act, 1969 for the registration of date of birth."

NOTICE

Whereas, Applicant Anita d/o Sh. Punjab Singh, r/o Village Amb Doli, P.O. Amb Pathiar, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.) personally appeared before the undersigned and submitted an application stating that her date of birth is 12-10-1988. However, due to inadvertence and lack of awareness, it was not recorded in the official records of the local Gram Panchayat Amb Pathiar. Therefore, it is necessary to have it entered in the Birth records of Gram Panchayat Amb Pathiar.

Accordingly, the general public is hereby informed through this notice and proclamation that if anyone has any objection in this regard, they may appear personally or through counsel on 18-06-2026 and register their objection. After this date, no objection will be entertained, and orders will be passed to record the date of birth of Anita d/o Sh. Punjab Singh, r/o Village Amb Doli, P.O. Amb Pathiar, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.), as 12-10-1988 in the records of G.P. Amb Pathiar unde section 13(3) of the Registration of Births and Deaths Act, 1969.

Issued today on dated 05-05-2026, under my signature and the seal of the court.

Seal. Sd/-

*Executive Magistrate*-cum-*Naib Tehsildar,*
*Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.).*

---

**In the Court of Assistant Collector-**cum**-Naib Tehsildar, Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.)**

Case No. : 814230/2026 Date of Hearing : 18-06-2026

In the matter of :

Rajinder Kaundal s/o Sh. Jagdish Chandar, r/o Mohal Bhati, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.) ..*Applicant.*

*Versus*

General Public ..*Respondent.*

Application for Correction of Name Under Section 37(2) of Land Revenue Act, 1954.

NOTICE

Whereas, Rajinder Kaundal s/o Sh. Jagdish Chandar, r/o Mohal Bhati, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.) has submitted an application under Section 37(2) of the Land Revenue Act, 1954 alongwith all supportive documents such as affidavit, Aadhar Card, 10th Marksheet, Ration Card, Jamabandi Parcha, and Parivar Nakal in the court of undersigned.

Wherein he stated that, he belongs to above mentioned address. His name is written as Rajinder in the land/revenue record of Mohal Bhati, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, which is wrong. His original/correct name is "Rajinder Kaundal". Therefore, he requests to correct his name as "Rajinder Kaundal" instead of Rajinder in the revenue record of Mohal Bhati, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, as per supportive documents enclosed by him with the application file.

Therefore, through this proclamation in Gazette/leading Newspaper, the general public is hereby informed that if any person having any objection for entry of correction in name of applicant mentioned above, may submit his/her objection in writing to this court before 18-06-2026. No objection will be entertained after prescribed period and application will be decided accordingly.

Given under my hand and seal of the Court.

Seal. Sd/-
*Assistant Collector*-cum-*Naib Tehsildar,*
*Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.).*

---

**In the Court of Assistant Collector-cum-Naib Tehsildar, Jawalamukhi,**
**Distt. Kangra (H.P.)**

Case No. : 814243/2026 Date of Hearing : 18-06-2026

In the matter of :

Rajender Singh s/o Sh. Ishwar Dass, r/o Mohal Hatli, P.O. Gummer, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.) ..*Applicant.*

*Versus*

General Public ..*Respondent.*

Application for Correction of Name Under Section 37(2) of Land Revenue Act, 1954.

NOTICE

Whereas, Rajinder Singh s/o Sh. Ishwar Dass, r/o Mohal Hatli, P.O. Gummer, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.) has submitted an application under Section 37(2) of the Land Revenue Act, 1954 alongwith all supportive documents such as affidavit, Aadhar Card, 10th Marksheet, Ration Card, Jamabandi Parcha, and Parivar Nakal in the court of undersigned.

Wherein he stated that, he belongs to above mentioned address. His name is written as Rajinder Kumar in the land/revenue record of Mohal Hatli, Mouza Gummer, Tehsil Jawalamukhi

which is wrong. His original/correct name is "Rajender Singh". Therefore, he requests to correct his name as "Rajender Singh" instead of Rajinder Kumar in the revenue record of Mohal Hatli, Mouza Gummer, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, as per supportive documents enclosed by him with the application file.

Therefore, through this proclamation in Gazette/leading Newspaper, the general public is hereby informed that if any person having any objection for entry of correction in name of applicant mentioned above, may submit his/her objection in writing to this court before 18-06-2026. No objection will be entertained after prescribed period and application will be decided accordingly.

Given under my hand and seal of the Court.

Seal. Sd/-

*Assistant Collector 2nd Grade,*
*Tehsil Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.).*

---

**In the Court of Assistant Collector-**cum**-Naib Tehsildar, Jawalamukhi,**
**Distt. Kangra (H.P.)**

Case No. : 814242/2026 Date of Hearing : 23-06-2026

In the matter of :

Joginder Singh s/o Sh. Roshan Lal, r/o Mohal Saletar, Mouza Amb, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.) ..*Applicant.*

*Versus*

General Public ..*Respondent.*

Application for Correction of Name Under Section 37(2) of Land Revenue Act, 1954.

NOTICE

Whereas, Joginder Singh s/o Sh. Roshan Lal, r/o Mohal Saletar, Mouza Amb, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.) has submitted an application under Section 37(2) of the Land Revenue Act, 1954 alongwith all supportive documents such as affidavit, Aadhar Card, PAN Card, Ration Card, Jamabandi Parcha, and Parivar Nakal in the court of undersigned.

Wherein he stated that, he belongs to above mentioned address. His name is written as Joginder Kumar in the land/revenue record of Mohal Saletar, Mouza Amb, which is wrong. His original/correct name is "Joginder Singh". Therefore, he requests to correct his name as "Joginder Singh" instead of Joginder Kumar in the revenue record of Mohal Saletar, Mouza Amb, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, as per supportive documents enclosed by him with the application file.

Therefore, through this proclamation in Gazette/leading Newspaper, the general public is hereby informed that if any person having any objection for entry of correction in name of applicant mentioned above, may submit his/her objection in writing to this court before

23-06-2026. No objection will be entertained after prescribed period and application will be decided accordingly.

Given under my hand and seal of the Court.

Seal. Sd/-
*Assistant Collector 2nd Grade,*
*Tehsil Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.).*

---

**In the Court of Assistant Collector-**cum**-Naib Tehsildar, Jawalamukhi,**
**Distt. Kangra (H.P.)**

Case No. : 814257/2026 Date of Hearing : 18-06-2026

In the matter of :

Braham Dass s/o Sh. Khushi Ram, r/o Mohal Doli, Mouza Amb, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.) ..*Applicant.*

*Versus*

General Public ..*Respondent.*

Application for Correction of Name Under Section 37(2) of Land Revenue Act, 1954.

NOTICE

Whereas, Braham Dass s/o Sh. Khushi Ram, r/o Mohal Doli, Mouza Amb, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.) has submitted an application under Section 37(2) of the Land Revenue Act, 1954 alongwith all supportive documents such as affidavit, Aadhar Card, School Leaving Certificate, Jamabandi Parcha, and Parivar Nakal in the court of undersigned.

Wherein, he stated that, he belongs to above mentioned address. His name is written as Brahmu in the land/revenue record of Mohal Doli, Mouza Amb, which is wrong. His original/correct name is “Braham Dass”. Therefore, he requests to correct his name as “Braham Dass” instead of Brahmu in the revenue record of Mohal Doli, Mouza Amb, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, as per supportive documents enclosed by him with the application file.

Therefore, through this proclamation in Gazette/leading Newspaper, the general public is hereby informed that if any person having any objection for entry of correction in name of applicant mentioned above, may submit his/her objection in writing to this court before 18-06-2026. No objection will be entertained after prescribed period and application will be decided accordingly.

Given under my hand and seal of the Court.

Seal. Sd/-
*Assistant Collector 2nd Grade,*
*Tehsil Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.).*

**In the Court of Executive Magistrate-**cum**-Naib Tehsildar, Tehsil Office, Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.)**

In the matter of :

Anita d/o Sh. Punjab Singh, r/o Village Amb Doli, P.O. Amb Pathiar, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.) ..*Applicant.*

*Versus*

General Public ..*Respondent.*

"Application under Section 13(3) of the Himachal Pradesh Registration of Births and Deaths Act, 1969 for the registration of date of birth."

NOTICE

Whereas, Applicant Anita d/o Sh. Punjab Singh, r/o Village Amb Doli, P.O. Amb Pathiar, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.) personally appeared before the undersigned and submitted an application stating that her date of birth is 12-10-1988. However, due to inadvertence and lack of awareness, it was not recorded in the official records of the local Gram Panchayat Amb Pathiar. Therefore, it is necessary to have it entered in the Birth records of Gram Panchayat Amb Pathiar.

Accordingly, the general public is hereby informed through this notice and proclamation that if anyone has any objection in this regard, they may appear personally or through counsel on 18-06-2026 and register their objection. After this date, no objection will be entertained, and orders will be passed to record the date of birth of Anita d/o Sh. Punjab Singh, r/o Village Amb Doli, P.O. Amb Pathiar, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.), as 12-10-1988 in the records of G.P. Amb Pathiar unde section 13(3) of the Registration of Births and Deaths Act, 1969.

Issued today on dated 05-05-2026, under my signature and the seal of the court.

Seal. Sd/-

*Executive Magistrate*-cum-*Naib Tehsildar,*
*Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.).*

---

**In the Court of Assistant Collector-**cum**-Naib Tehsildar, Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.)**

Case No. : 814230/2026 Date of Hearing : 18-06-2026

In the matter of :

Rajinder Kaundal s/o Sh. Jagdish Chandar, r/o Mohal Bhati, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.) ..*Applicant.*

*Versus*

General Public ..*Respondent.*

Application for Correction of Name Under Section 37(2) of Land Revenue Act, 1954.

NOTICE

Whereas, Rajinder Kaundal s/o Sh. Jagdish Chandar, r/o Mohal Bhati, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.) has submitted an application under Section 37(2) of the Land Revenue Act, 1954 alongwith all supportive documents such as affidavit, Aadhar Card, 10th Marksheet, Ration Card, Jamabandi Parcha, and Parivar Nakal in the court of undersigned.

Wherein he stated that, he belongs to above mentioned address. His name is written as Rajinder in the land/revenue record of Mohal Bhati, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, which is wrong. His original/correct name is "Rajinder Kaundal". Therefore, he requests to correct his name as "Rajinder Kaundal" instead of Rajinder in the revenue record of Mohal Bhati, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, as per supportive documents enclosed by him with the application file.

Therefore, through this proclamation in Gazette/leading Newspaper, the general public is hereby informed that if any person having any objection for entry of correction in name of applicant mentioned above, may submit his/her objection in writing to this court before 18-06-2026. No objection will be entertained after prescribed period and application will be decided accordingly.

Given under my hand and seal of the Court.

Seal. Sd/-
*Assistant Collector*-cum-*Naib Tehsildar,*
*Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.).*

---

**In the Court of Assistant Collector-cum-Naib Tehsildar, Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.)**

Case No. : 814243/2026 Date of Hearing : 18-06-2026

In the matter of :

Rajender Singh s/o Sh. Ishwar Dass, r/o Mohal Hatli, P.O. Gummer, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.) ..*Applicant.*

*Versus*

General Public ..*Respondent.*

Application for Correction of Name Under Section 37(2) of Land Revenue Act, 1954.

NOTICE

Whereas, Rajinder Singh s/o Sh. Ishwar Dass, r/o Mohal Hatli, P.O. Gummer, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.) has submitted an application under Section 37(2) of the Land Revenue Act, 1954 alongwith all supportive documents such as affidavit, Aadhar Card, 10th Marksheet, Ration Card, Jamabandi Parcha, and Parivar Nakal in the court of undersigned.

Wherein he stated that, he belongs to above mentioned address. His name is written as Rajinder Kumar in the land/revenue record of Mohal Hatli, Mouza Gummer, Tehsil Jawalamukhi

which is wrong. His original/correct name is "Rajender Singh". Therefore, he requests to correct his name as "Rajender Singh" instead of Rajinder Kumar in the revenue record of Mohal Hatli, Mouza Gummer, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, as per supportive documents enclosed by him with the application file.

Therefore, through this proclamation in Gazette/leading Newspaper, the general public is hereby informed that if any person having any objection for entry of correction in name of applicant mentioned above, may submit his/her objection in writing to this court before 18-06-2026. No objection will be entertained after prescribed period and application will be decided accordingly.

Given under my hand and seal of the Court.

Seal. Sd/-

*Assistant Collector 2nd Grade,*
*Tehsil Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.).*

---

**In the Court of Assistant Collector-**cum**-Naib Tehsildar, Jawalamukhi,**
**Distt. Kangra (H.P.)**

Case No. : 814242/2026 Date of Hearing : 23-06-2026

In the matter of :

Joginder Singh s/o Sh. Roshan Lal, r/o Mohal Saletar, Mouza Amb, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.) ..*Applicant.*

*Versus*

General Public ..*Respondent.*

Application for Correction of Name Under Section 37(2) of Land Revenue Act, 1954.

NOTICE

Whereas, Joginder Singh s/o Sh. Roshan Lal, r/o Mohal Saletar, Mouza Amb, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.) has submitted an application under Section 37(2) of the Land Revenue Act, 1954 alongwith all supportive documents such as affidavit, Aadhar Card, PAN Card, Ration Card, Jamabandi Parcha, and Parivar Nakal in the court of undersigned.

Wherein he stated that, he belongs to above mentioned address. His name is written as Joginder Kumar in the land/revenue record of Mohal Saletar, Mouza Amb, which is wrong. His original/correct name is "Joginder Singh". Therefore, he requests to correct his name as "Joginder Singh" instead of Joginder Kumar in the revenue record of Mohal Saletar, Mouza Amb, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, as per supportive documents enclosed by him with the application file.

Therefore, through this proclamation in Gazette/leading Newspaper, the general public is hereby informed that if any person having any objection for entry of correction in name of applicant mentioned above, may submit his/her objection in writing to this court before

23-06-2026. No objection will be entertained after prescribed period and application will be decided accordingly.

Given under my hand and seal of the Court.

Seal. Sd/-
*Assistant Collector 2nd Grade,*
*Tehsil Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.).*

---

**In the Court of Assistant Collector-**cum**-Naib Tehsildar, Jawalamukhi,**
**Distt. Kangra (H.P.)**

Case No. : 814257/2026 Date of Hearing : 18-06-2026

In the matter of :

Braham Dass s/o Sh. Khushi Ram, r/o Mohal Doli, Mouza Amb, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.) ..*Applicant.*

*Versus*

General Public ..*Respondent.*

Application for Correction of Name Under Section 37(2) of Land Revenue Act, 1954.

NOTICE

Whereas, Braham Dass s/o Sh. Khushi Ram, r/o Mohal Doli, Mouza Amb, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.) has submitted an application under Section 37(2) of the Land Revenue Act, 1954 alongwith all supportive documents such as affidavit, Aadhar Card, School Leaving Certificate, Jamabandi Parcha, and Parivar Nakal in the court of undersigned.

Wherein, he stated that, he belongs to above mentioned address. His name is written as Brahmu in the land/revenue record of Mohal Doli, Mouza Amb, which is wrong. His original/correct name is “Braham Dass”. Therefore, he requests to correct his name as “Braham Dass” instead of Brahmu in the revenue record of Mohal Doli, Mouza Amb, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, as per supportive documents enclosed by him with the application file.

Therefore, through this proclamation in Gazette/leading Newspaper, the general public is hereby informed that if any person having any objection for entry of correction in name of applicant mentioned above, may submit his/her objection in writing to this court before 18-06-2026. No objection will be entertained after prescribed period and application will be decided accordingly.

Given under my hand and seal of the Court.

Seal. Sd/-
*Assistant Collector 2nd Grade,*
*Tehsil Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.).*

**In the Court of Executive Magistrate-cum-Naib Tehsildar, Tehsil Office, Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.)**

In the matter of :

Anita d/o Sh. Punjab Singh, r/o Village Amb Doli, P.O. Amb Pathiar, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.) ..*Applicant.*

*Versus*

General Public ..*Respondent.*

"Application under Section 13(3) of the Himachal Pradesh Registration of Births and Deaths Act, 1969 for the registration of date of birth."

NOTICE

Whereas, Applicant Anita d/o Sh. Punjab Singh, r/o Village Amb Doli, P.O. Amb Pathiar, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.) personally appeared before the undersigned and submitted an application stating that her date of birth is 12-10-1988. However, due to inadvertence and lack of awareness, it was not recorded in the official records of the local Gram Panchayat Amb Pathiar. Therefore, it is necessary to have it entered in the Birth records of Gram Panchayat Amb Pathiar.

Accordingly, the general public is hereby informed through this notice and proclamation that if anyone has any objection in this regard, they may appear personally or through counsel on 18-06-2026 and register their objection. After this date, no objection will be entertained, and orders will be passed to record the date of birth of Anita d/o Sh. Punjab Singh, r/o Village Amb Doli, P.O. Amb Pathiar, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.), as 12-10-1988 in the records of G.P. Amb Pathiar unde section 13(3) of the Registration of Births and Deaths Act, 1969.

Issued today on dated 05-05-2026, under my signature and the seal of the court.

Seal. Sd/-

*Executive Magistrate*-cum-*Naib Tehsildar,*
*Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.).*

---

**In the Court of Assistant Collector-**cum-**Naib Tehsildar, Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.) 176 036**

Case No : 814283/2026 Date of Hearing : 28-05-2026

In the matter of :

Gulam Deen s/o Noor Deen, r/o Vill. Bareti Mouza Darang, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.) . . *Applicant.*

*Versus*

General Public . . *Respondent.*

*Application of Correction of Name Under Section 37(2) of Land Revenue Act, 1954.*

Gulam Deen s/o Noor Deen, r/o Vill. Bareti Mouza Darang, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.) has submitted an application under section 37(2) of the Land Revenue Act, 1954 alongwith all supportive document such as affidavit, Aadhar Card, PAN Card, Driving License, Jamabandi Parcha and Parivar Nakal in the court of undersigned.

Wherein he stated that, he belongs to above mentioned address. His name is written as Mulam Deen in the land/revenue record of Mohal Darang which is wrong. His original/correct name is "Gulam Deen". Therefore, he request to correct his name as "Gulam Deen" instead of Mulam Deen in the revenue record of Mohal Darang, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, as per supportive document enclosed by him with the application file.

Therefore, through this proclamation in gazette/leading newspaper, the general public is hereby informed that, if any person having any objection for entry of correction in name of applicant mentioned above, may submit his/her objection in writing to this court before 28-05-2026. No objection will be entertained after prescribed period and application will be decided accordingly.

Given under my hand and seal of the Court on 28-04-2026.

Seal. Sd/-

*Assistant Collector 2nd Grade,*
*Tehsil Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.).*

---

**In the Court of Assistant Collector-**cum**-Naib Tehsildar, Jawalamukhi,**
**Distt. Kangra (H.P.) 176 036**

Case No : 814269/2026 Date of Hearing : 02-06-2026

In the matter of :

Virender Kumar s/o Khushi Ram, r/o Mohal Kalidhar Bihan-1, Mouza Bohan, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.) . . *Applicant*.

*Versus*

General Public . . *Respondent*.

*Application of Correction of Name Under Section 37(2) of Land Revenue Act, 1954.*

Virender Kumar s/o Khushi Ram, r/o Mohal Kalidhar Bihan-1, Mouza Bohan, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.) has submitted an application under section 37(2) of the Land Revenue Act, 1954 alongwith all supportive document such as affidavit, Aadhar Card, Jamabandi Parcha, PAN Card and School Leaving Certificate in the court of undersigned.

Wherein he stated that, he belongs to above mentioned address. His name is written as Virender Singh in the land/revenue record of Mohal Khalidhar Bohan-1, Mouza Bohan which is wrong. His original/correct name is "Virender Kumar". Therefore, he request to correct his name as

"Virender Kumar" instead of Virender Singh in the revenue record of Mohal Kalidhar Bohan-1, Mouza Bohan, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, as per supportive document enclosed by him with the application file.

Therefore, through this proclamation in gazette/leading newspaper, the general public is hereby informed that, if any person having any objection for entry of correction in name of applicant mentioned above, may submit his/her objection in writing to this court before 02-06-2026. No objection will be entertained after prescribed period and application will be decided accordingly.

Given under my hand and seal of the Court on 04-05-2026.

Seal. Sd/-
*Assistant Collector 2nd Grade,*
*Tehsil Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.).*

---

**In the Court of Assistant Collector-**cum**-Naib Tehsildar, Jawalamukhi,**
**Distt. Kangra (H.P.) 176 036**

Case No : 814244/2026 Date of Hearing : 02-06-2026

In the matter of :

Dharam Singh s/o Makhan Ram, r/o Mohal Katyalu Gummer, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.) . . *Applicant*.

*Versus*

General Public . . *Respondent*.

*Application of Correction of Name Under Section 37(2) of Land Revenue Act, 1954.*

Dharam Singh s/o Makhan Ram, r/o Mohal Katyalu Gummer, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.) has submitted an application under section 37(2) of the Land Revenue Act, 1954 alongwith all supportive document such as affidavit, Aadhar Card, PAN Card, 10th Marksheet, Privar Nakal and Jamabandi Parcha, in the court of undersigned.

Wherein he stated that, he belongs to above mentioned address. His name is written as Dharam Chand in the land/revenue record of Mohal Gharoon Mouza Gummer which is wrong. His original/correct name is "Dharam Singh". Therefore, he request to correct his name as "Dharam Singh" instead of Dharam Chand in the revenue record of Mohal Dohag Mouza Gummer, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, as per supportive document enclosed by him with the application file.

Therefore, through this proclamation in gazette/leading newspaper, the general public is hereby informed that, if any person having any objection for entry of correction in name of applicant mentioned above, may submit his/her objection in writing to this court before

02-06-2026. No objection will be entertained after prescribed period and application will be decided accordingly.

Given under my hand and seal of the Court on 04-05-2026.

Seal. Sd/-

*Assistant Collector 2nd Grade,*
*Tehsil Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.).*

---

**In the Court of Assistant Collector-**cum**-Naib Tehsildar, Jawalamukhi,**
**Distt. Kangra (H.P.)-176 036**

Case No : 814271/2026 Date of Hearing : 02-06-2026

In the matter of :

Balbir Singh s/o Sh. Ram Parsad, r/o Mohal Katyalu Mouza Gummer, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.) . . *Applicant*.

*Versus*

General Public . . *Respondent*.

*Application of Correction of Name Under Section 37(2) of Land Revenue Act, 1954.*

Balbir Singh s/o Sh. Ram Parsad, r/o Mohal Katyalu Mouza Gummer, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.) has submitted an application under section 37(2) of the Land Revenue Act, 1954 alongwith all supportive document such as affidavit, Aadhar Card, PAN Card, Ration Card, Privar Nakal and Jamabandi Parcha, in the court of undersigned.

Wherein he stated that, he belongs to above mentioned address. His name is written as Balbir and his father name is written as Fandi in the land/revenue record of Mohal Katyalu Mouza Gummer which is wrong. His original/correct name is "Balbir Singh" and his father's original/correct name is "Ram Parsad". Therefore, he request to correct his name as "Balbir Singh" instead of Balbir and his father's name as "Ram Parsad" instead of Fandi in the revenue record of Mohal Katyalu Mouza Gummer, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, as per supportive document enclosed by him with the application file.

Therefore, through this proclamation in gazette/leading newspaper, the general public is hereby informed that, if any person having any objection for entry of correction in name of applicant mentioned above, may submit his/her objection in writing to this court before 02-06-2026. No objection will be entertained after prescribed period and application will be decided accordingly.

Given under my hand and seal of the Court on 04-05-2026.

Seal. Sd/-

*Assistant Collector 2nd Grade,*
*Tehsil Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.).*

**ब अदालत श्री पी0 सी0 कौण्डल तहसीलदार एंव सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी,**
**तहसील सुलह, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)**

किस्म मुकद्दमा : नाम दुरुस्ती तारीख पेशी : 28–05–2026

चुनी लाल पुत्र गरभू राम, निवासी गांव व डा0 घनेटा, तहसील सुलह, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)

बनाम

आम जनता

विषय.––नाम दुरुस्ती करवाने बारे।

प्रार्थी चुनी लाल पुत्र गरभू राम, निवासी गांव व डा0 घनेटा, तहसील सुलह, जिला कांगड़ा, हि0प्र0 ने इस अदालत में प्रार्थना–पत्र मय शपथ पत्र, परिवार रजिस्टर नकल, आधार कार्ड, पैन कार्ड, स्कूल प्रमाण–पत्र आदि दस्तावेज प्रस्तुत किए कि प्रार्थी के पिता का सही नाम गरभू राम पुत्र लाला है। जबकि महाल महादेव के राजस्व अभिलेख में गरभू पुत्र लाल व महाल ब्राहकड के राजस्व अभिलेख में सहवन भडिजू उपनाम गरभू पुत्र लाला दर्ज कागजात माल है, जोकि गलत है। अतः प्रार्थी महाल महादेव के राजस्व में अपने पिता का नाम गरभू के स्थान पर गरभू राम व ब्राहकड के राजस्व अभिलेख में भडिजू उपनाम गरभू के स्थान पर भडिजू उपनाम गरभू राम दर्ज कागजात माल करवाना चाहता है।

अतः इस राजपत्र इश्तहार / मुश्त्री मुनादी के माध्यम से आम जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि उपरोक्त नाम की दुरुस्ती बारे किसी को कोई एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 28–05–2026 को असालतन या वकालतन इस कार्यालय में हाजिर होकर उजर पेश कर सकता है हाजिर न आने की सूरत में एकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाकर आगामी आदेश पारित कर दिए जाऐंगे।

आज दिनांक 30–04–2026 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर सहित जारी किया गया।

मोहर। हस्ताक्षरित / –
सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी,
सुलह, जिला कागंड़ा (हि0प्र0)।

————————

**In the Court of Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Dheera, Exercising the Powers of Marriage Officer, Dheera, Distt. Kangra (H.P.)**

In case :

Pankaj Bhatt and Neha Thakur

*Versus*

General Public

Application under Section 16 of Special Marriage Act 1954 for the registration of Marriage.

An application under section 16 of the Special Marriage Act, 1954 has been received by the undersigned from Shri Pankaj Bhatt s/o Jagannath, r/o Village Phagurta, P.O. Sanhoon, Tehsil

Thural, District Kangra (H.P.) Pin-176 093 and Neha Thakur d/o Thalia Ram, r/o Thakur Niwas, Gussan Road, V.P.O. Meheli, Kasumpti, Tehsil Shimla, Rural, District Shimla (H.P.) Pin-171 009. That they have solemnized their marriage on dated 11-10-2025 at Shiv Shakti Mandir Paddar Chamunda, Tehsil Dharamshala, District Kangra, H.P. as per Hindu rites and customs and living as husband and wife since then. If there is any objection to the registration of this marriage, the objection in person or through counsel to be submitted to this office on or before 30-06-2026 otherwise the marriage will be registered.

Seal. Sd/-
*Marriage Officer*-cum-*SDM,*
*Dheera, District Kangra (H.P.).*

---

**Before Rajat Sharma, Assistant Collector, First Grade, Tehsil Nirmand, District Kullu (H.P.)**

Smt. Anita Devi w/o Sangat Ram, s/o Daulat Ram r/o Village Twar, Phati Twar, Tehsil Nirmand, Distt Kullu (H.P.). . . *Plaintiff.*

*Versus*

General Public . . *Respondent.*

*Subject.— Case-Correction of name in Revenue Records u/s 38 (a) of Himachal Pradesh Land Revenue Act, 1954.*

Smt. Anita Devi w/o Sangat Ram, s/o Daulat Ram r/o Village Twar, Phati Twar, Tehsil Nirmand, Distt Kullu (H.P.) has filled an application and affidavit in this court stating that her correct name in Aadhar Card, Family Register copy, Panchayat records and other documents is "Anita Devi." However, in the revenue records, specifically in the Muhal Twar Jamabandi for the year 2018-19 her name is recorded as "Neeta Devi" which is incorrect. The petitioner has requested correction of the above-mentioned name.

Therefore, the general public and all concerned are hereby informed through this gazette advertisement and proclamation that if any person has any objection regarding the said name correction, such objector may appear in person or through an authorized agent or advocate in this court on 02-06-2026 at 10.00 A.M. for the hearing of this case and raise their objection. In the absence of any objection on the said date, orders for correction of the name will be passed, and no objection will be entertained after the date of hearing, *i.e.*, 02-06-2026.

Issued today on 12-05-2026 with my signature and the seal of the court.

Seal. Sd/-
*Assistant Collector, First Grade,*
*Tehsil Nirmand, District Kullu (H.P.).*

**Before the District Registrar (Marriages)**-cum-**Additional Deputy Commissioner Kullu, District Kullu (H.P.)**

1. Sh. Kunal Dhiman s/o Sh. Hitesh Dhiman, r/o Village Dhamsehar, P.O. Mohal, Tehsil & District Kullu (H.P.).

2. Smt. Taniya d/o Sh. Uttam Chand, r/o Village Badah, P.O. Mohal, Tehsil & District Kullu (H.P.).

*Versus*

General Public

*Subject.—Regarding Registration of Marriage u/s 8(3) of the H.P. Registration of Marriage Act, 1996.*

Sh. Kunal Dhiman s/o Sh. Hitesh Dhiman, r/o Village Dhamsehar, P.O. Mohal, Tehsil & District Kullu, H.P. & Smt. Taniya d/o Sh. Uttam Chand, r/o Village Badah, P.O. Mohal, Tehsil & District Kullu, H.P. have filed an application alongwith the affidavits in the office of undersigned stating therein that they have solemnised their marriage on 21-10-2025, but marriage has not been found entered in the records of Registrar of Marriage, Gram Panchayat Dhamsehar, in Tehsil Kullu, District Kullu (H.P.).

Therefore, objections are hereby invited from the general public through this notice, that if anyone has any objection regarding the registration of this marriage, they can file their objection personally or in writing before the court of the undersigned within 30 days from the publication of this notice.

Issued my hand and seal of the court today on 8th May, 2026.

Seal.

Sd/-
(ASHWANI KUMAR),
*District Registrar (Marriages)*-cum-*ADC, Kullu, District Kullu (H.P.).*

---

**Before the District Registrar (Marriages)**-cum-**Additional Deputy Commissioner Kullu, District Kullu (H.P.)**

1. Sh. Ajay Deep s/o Sh. Shamsher Singh, r/o Village Dhamsehar, P.O. Mohal, Tehsil & District Kullu, (H.P.)

2. Smt. Treeti d/o Sh. Hari Ram, r/o Village Badah, P.O. Mohal, Tehsil & District Kullu (H.P.).

*Versus*

General Public

*Subject.—Regarding Registration of Marriage u/s 8(3) of the H.P. Registration of Marriage Act, 1996.*

Sh. Ajay Deep s/o Sh. Shamsher Singh, r/o Village Dhamsehar, P.O. Mohal, Tehsil & District Kullu, H.P. & Smt. Treeti d/o Sh. Hari Ram, r/o Village Badah, P.O. Mohal, Tehsil & District Kullu, H.P. have filed an application alongwith the affidavits in the office of undersigned stating therein that they have solemnised their marriage on 23-06-2025, but marriage has not been found entered in the records of Registrar of Marriage, Gram Panchayat Balh-I, in Tehsil Kullu, District Kullu (H.P.).

Therefore, objections are hereby invited from the general public through this notice, that if anyone has any objection regarding the registration of this marriage, they can file their objection personally or in writing before the court of the undersigned within 30 days from the publication of this notice.

Issued my hand and seal of the court today on 8th May, 2026.

Sd/-

Seal. (ASHWANI KUMAR),

*District Registrar (Marriages)*-cum-*ADC,*

*Kullu, District Kullu (H.P.).*

---

**ब अदालत सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय क्षेणी, तहसील सैंज, जिला कुल्लू, हिमाचल प्रदेश**

मिसल नं0 : 818648 / 26 आगामी पेशी : 11–06–2026

श्री दीवान चन्द पुत्र श्री दलू, निवासी गांव व डॉ0 शलवाड़, तहसील सैंज, जिला कुल्लू (हि0प्र0)

प्रार्थी।

बनाम

आम जनता

विषय.–– Section 37 of H.P. Land Revenue Act, 1954 (राजस्व इंद्राज दुरुस्ती)।

श्री दीवान चन्द पुत्र श्री दलू, निवासी गांव व डॉ0 शलवाड़, तहसील सैंज, जिला कुल्लू (हि0प्र0) ने इस अदालत में ऑनलाइन आवेदन पत्र प्रस्तुत किया है कि उसका नाम राजस्व अभिलेख मोहाल कनौन पटवार वृत्त कनौन में दीवान सिंह दर्ज है जोकि गलत दर्ज हुआ है जबकि अन्य दस्तावेजों में उसका नाम दीवान चन्द दर्ज है, जोकि सही है। प्रार्थी ने ब्यान हल्फिया दिया है कि दीवान सिंह व दीवान चन्द दोनों नाम उसके ही हैं। प्रार्थी राजस्व अभिलेख पटवार वृत्त कनौन के मोहाल कनौन में अपना नाम दीवान सिंह के बजाय दीवान सिंह उर्फ दीवान चन्द दर्ज करवाना चाहता है। प्रार्थी ने इस अदालत से प्रार्थना की है कि उसका नाम दर्ज करने के सम्बन्धित क्षेत्रीय कानूनगो / पटवारी को लिखित आदेश पारित करने की कृपा की है।

अतः इस इश्तहार द्वारा सर्वसाधारण को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उक्त प्रार्थी का नाम राजस्व अभिलेख पटवार वृत्त कनौन के मोहाल कनौन में दर्ज करने बारा कोई उजर / एतराज हो तो वह असालतन / वकालतन तारीख पेशी 11–06–2026 को सुबह 11.00 बजे हाजिर होकर अपना एतराज पेश कर सकता है। निर्धारित अवधि के पश्चात् कोई उजर व एतराज प्राप्त न होने पर प्रार्थना–पत्र स्वीकार किया जाकर राजस्व अभिलेख पटवार वृत कनौन के मोहाल कनौन तहसील सैन्ज में उक्त प्रार्थी दीवान सिंह उर्फ दीवान चन्द दर्ज करने के आदेश पारित किए जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 12–05–2026 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी हुआ।

मोहर। हस्ताक्षरित / –
सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय क्षेणी,
तहसील सैंज, जिला कुल्लू (हि0प्र0)।

————————

**ब अदालत सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय क्षेणी, तहसील सैंज, जिला कुल्लू, हिमाचल प्रदेश**

मिसल नं0 : 818647 / 26 आगामी पेशी : 11–06–2026

श्री गोवर्धन सिंह पुत्र स्व0 श्री खूब राम, निवासी गांव दलाशनी, डॉ0 सचानी, तहसील भून्तर, जिला कुल्लू (हि0प्र0) प्रार्थी।

बनाम

आम जनता

विषय.–– Section 37 of H.P. Land Revenue Act, 1954 (राजस्व इंद्राज दुरुस्ती)।

श्री गोवर्धन सिंह पुत्र स्व0 श्री खूब राम, निवासी गांव दलाशनी, डॉ0 सचानी, तहसील भून्तर, जिला कुल्लू (हि0प्र0) ने इस अदालत में ऑनलाइन आवेदन पत्र प्रस्तुत किया है कि उसका नाम राजस्व अभिलेख मोहाल कनौन पटवार वृत्त कनौन में गूरध्यान सिंह दर्ज हुआ है जोकि गलत दर्ज हुआ है जबकि अन्य दस्तावेजों में उसका नाम गोवर्धन सिंह दर्ज है, जोकि सही है। प्रार्थी ने ब्यान हल्फिया दिया है कि गूरध्यान सिंह व गोवर्धन सिंह दोनों नाम उसके ही है। प्रार्थी राजस्व अभिलेख पटवार वृत्त कनौन के मोहाल कनौन में अपना नाम गूरध्यान सिंह के बजाय गूरध्यान सिंह उर्फ गोवर्धन सिंह दर्ज करवाना चाहता है। प्रार्थी ने इस अदालत से प्रार्थना की है कि उसका नाम दर्ज करने से सम्बन्धित क्षेत्रिय कानूनगो / पटवारी को लिखित आदेश पारित करने की कृपा की है।

अतः इस इश्तहार द्वारा सर्वसाधारण को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उक्त प्रार्थी का नाम राजस्व अभिलेख पटवार वृत कनौन के मोहाल कनौन में दर्ज करने बारा कोई उजर / एतराज हो तो वह असालतन / वकालतन तारीख पेशी 11–06–2026 को सुबह 11.00 बजे हाजिर होकर अपना एतराज पेश कर सकता है। निर्धारित अवधि के पश्चात् कोई उजर व एतराज प्राप्त न होने पर प्रार्थना–पत्र स्वीकार किया जाकर राजस्व अभिलेख पटवार वृत्त कनौन के मोहाल कनौन तहसील सैन्ज में उक्त प्रार्थी का नाम गूरध्यान सिंह उर्फ गोवर्धन सिंह दर्ज करने के आदेश पारित किए जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 12–05–2026 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी हुआ।

मोहर। हस्ताक्षरित / –
सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय क्षेणी,
तहसील सैंज, जिला कुल्लू (हि0प्र0)।

————————

**ब अदालत सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय क्षेणी, तहसील सैंज, जिला कुल्लू, हिमाचल प्रदेश**

मिसल नं0 : 818644 / 26 आगामी पेशी : 06–06–2026

श्री प्रभात कुमार पुत्र श्री ठाकरदत, निवासी गांव तुंघ, डॉ0 बजाहरा, तहसील सैंज, जिला कुल्लू (हि0प्र0) प्रार्थी।

बनाम

आम जनता

विषय.–– Section 37 of H.P. Land Revenue Act, 1954 (राजस्व इंद्राज दुरुस्ती)।

श्री प्रभात कुमार पुत्र श्री ठाकरदत, निवासी गांव तुंघ, डॉ0 बजाहरा, तहसील सैंज, जिला कुल्लू (हि0प्र0) ने इस अदालत में ऑनलाइन आवेदन पत्र प्रस्तुत किया है कि उसका नाम राजस्व अभिलेख मोहाल शैंशर पटवार वृत्त शैंशर में प्रभात सिंह दर्ज है जोकि गलत दर्ज हुआ है जबकि अन्य दस्तावेजों में उसका नाम प्रभात कुमार दर्ज है, जोकि सही है। प्रार्थी ने ब्यान हल्फिया दिया है कि प्रभात सिंह व प्रभात कुमार दोनों नाम उसके ही हैं। प्रार्थी राजस्व अभिलेख पटवार वृत शैंशर के मोहाल शैंशर में अपना नाम प्रभात सिंह के बजाय प्रभात सिंह उर्फ प्रभात कुमार दर्ज करवाना चाहता है। प्रार्थी ने इस अदालत से प्रार्थना की है कि उसका नाम दर्ज करने के सम्बन्धित क्षेत्रीय कानूनगो / पटवारी को लिखित आदेश पारित करने की कृपा की है।

अतः इस इश्तहार द्वारा सर्वसाधारण को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उक्त प्रार्थी का नाम राजस्व अभिलेख पटवार वृत शैंशर के मोहाल शैंशर में दर्ज करने बारा कोई उजर / एतराज हो तो वह असालतन / वकालतन तारीख पेशी 06–06–2026 को सुबह 11.00 बजे हाजिर होकर अपना एतराज पेश कर सकता है। निर्धारित अवधि के पश्चात् कोई उजर व एतराज प्राप्त न होने पर प्रार्थना–पत्र स्वीकार किया जाकर राजस्व अभिलेख पटवार वृत शैंशर के मोहाल शैंशर तहसील सैन्ज में उक्त प्रार्थी का नाम प्रभात सिंह उर्फ प्रभात कुमार दर्ज करने के आदेश पारित किए जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 07–05–2026 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित / –
सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय क्षेणी,
तहसील सैंज, जिला कुल्लू (हि0प्र0)।

––––––––––

**ब अदालत कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, तहसील सैंज, जिला कुल्लू, हिमाचल प्रदेश**

मिसल नं0 : 39 / 2026 आगामी पेशी : 05–06–2026

श्रीमती रामी देवी पुत्री स्व0 श्री गोपी चन्द, निवासी गांव शरन, डॉ0 रैला, तहसील सैंज, जिला कुल्लू (हि0प्र0) प्रार्थिया।

बनाम

आम जनता

विषय.–– प्रार्थना पत्र जन्म व मृत्यु पंजीकरण जेर धारा 13 (3) पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

श्रीमती रामी देवी पुत्री स्व0 श्री गोपी चन्द, निवासी गांव शरन, डॉ0 रैला, तहसील सैंज, जिला कुल्लू (हि0प्र0) ने एक आवेदन पत्र जिला रजिस्ट्रार जन्म व मृत्यु एवं मुख्य चिकित्सा अधिकारी कुल्लू, जिला कुल्लू के कार्यालय पत्र संख्या HFW-ST(B&D) Delay Birth and Death-KLU-2026-5516-17, Dated 30-03-2026 जो कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, तहसील सैंज को सम्बोंधित है, इस अदालत में प्रस्तुत किया है तथा प्रार्थिन ने शपथ पत्र में उल्लेख किया है कि उसकी जन्म तिथि 01–07–1945 है जोकि अज्ञानतावश ग्राम पंचायत रैला के रिकार्ड में दर्ज नहीं हुई है। प्रार्थिया अपनी जन्म तिथि 01–07–1945 दर्ज करवाना चाहती है।

प्रार्थिन ने इस अदालत से प्रार्थना की है कि उसकी जन्म तिथि दर्ज करने के सम्बंधित पंचायत को लिखित आदेश पारित करने की कृपा करें।

अतः इस इश्तहार द्वारा सर्वसाधारण को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उक्त प्रार्थिया की जन्म तिथि ग्राम पंचायत रैला के जन्म परिवार रजिस्टर भाग–1 में दर्ज करने बारा कोई उजर / एतराज हो तो वह असालतन / वकालतन तारीख पेशी 05–06–2026 को सुबह 11.00 बजे हाजिर होकर अपना एतराज पेश कर सकता है। निर्धारित अवधि के पश्चात् कोई उजर व एतराज प्राप्त न होने पर प्रार्थना–पत्र स्वीकार जाकर ग्रम पंचायत रैला तहसील सैन्ज में उक्त प्रार्थिया की जन्म तिथि 01–07–1945 दर्ज करने के आदेश पारित किए जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 05–05–2026 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी हुआ।

मोहर। हस्ताक्षरित / –
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
तहसील सैंज, जिला कुल्लू (हि0प्र0)।

————————

**ब अदालत कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, तहसील सैंज, जिला कुल्लू, हिमाचल प्रदेश**

मिसल नं0 : 40 / 2026 आगामी पेशी : 05–06–2026

श्रीमती दसमु देवी पुत्री श्री राम दास, निवासी गांव खड़ोआ, डॉ0 रैला, तहसील सैंज, जिला कुल्लू (हि0प्र0) प्रार्थिया।

बनाम

आम जनता

विषय.–– प्रार्थना पत्र मृत्यु पंजीकरण जेर धारा 13 (3) पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

श्रीमती दसमु देवी पुत्री श्री राम दास, निवासी गांव खड़ोआ, डॉ0 रैला, तहसील सैंज, जिला कुल्लू (हि0प्र0) ने एक आवेदन पत्र जिला रजिस्ट्रार जन्म व मृत्यु एवं मुख्य चिकित्सा अधिकारी कुल्लू, जिला कुल्लू के कार्यालय पत्र संख्या HFW-ST(B&D) Delay Birth and Death-KLU-2026-6218-19, Dated 16-04-2026 जो कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, तहसील सैंज को सम्बोंधित है, इस अदालत में प्रस्तुत किया है तथा प्रार्थिन ने शपथ पत्र में उल्लेख किया है कि उसकी जन्म तिथि 01–06–1966 है जोकि अज्ञानतावश ग्राम पंचायत रैला–1 के रिकार्ड में दर्ज नहीं हुई है। प्रार्थिया अपनी जन्म तिथि 01–06–1966 दर्ज करवाना चाहती है प्रार्थिन ने इस अदालत से प्रार्थना की है कि उसकी जन्म तिथि दर्ज करने के सम्बंधित पंचायत को लिखित आदेश पारित करने की कृपा करें।

अतः इस इश्तहार द्वारा सर्वसाधारण को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उक्त प्रार्थिया की जन्म तिथि ग्रम पंचायत रैला–1 के जन्म परिवार रजिस्टर भाग–1 में दर्ज करने बारा कोई उजर / एतराज हो तो वह असालतन / वकालतन तारीख पेशी 05–06–2026 को सुबह 11.00 बजे हाजिर होकर अपना एतराज पेश कर सकता है। निर्धारित अवधि के पश्चात् कोई उजर व एतराज प्राप्त न होने पर प्रार्थना–पत्र स्वीकार किया जाकर ग्रम पंचायत रैला–1, तहसील सैन्ज में उक्त प्रार्थिया की जन्म तिथि 01–06–1966 दर्ज करने के आदेश पारित किए जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 05–05–2026 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी हुआ।

मोहर। हस्ताक्षरित / –
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
तहसील सैंज, जिला कुल्लू (हि0प्र0)।

**ब अदालत कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, तहसील सैंज, जिला कुल्लू, हिमाचल प्रदेश**

मिसल नं0 : 41 / 2026 आगामी पेशी : 05–06–2026

श्रीमती सवित्रा देवी पुत्री श्री नरोतु, निवासी गांव भौंरूथाच, डॉ0 बनोगी, तहसील सैंज, जिला कुल्लू (हि0प्र0) ..... प्रार्थिया।

बनाम

आम जनता

विषय.–– प्रार्थना पत्र जन्म व मृत्यु पंजीकरण जेर धारा 13 (3) पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

श्रीमती सवित्रा देवी पुत्री श्री नरोतु, निवासी गांव भौंरूथाच, डॉ0 बनोगी, तहसील सैंज, जिला कुल्लू (हि0प्र0) ने एक आवेदन पत्र जिला रजिस्ट्रार जन्म व मृत्यु एवं मुख्य चिकित्सा अधिकारी कुल्लू, जिला कुल्लू के कार्यालय पत्र संख्या HFW-ST(B&D) Delay Birth and Death-KLU-2026-6384, Dated 17-04-2026 जो कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, तहसील सैंज को सम्बोंधित है, इस अदालत में प्रस्तुत किया है तथा प्रार्थिन ने शपथ पत्र में उल्लेख किया है कि उसकी जन्म तिथि 01–07–1966 है जोकि अज्ञानतावश ग्राम पंचायत बनोगी के रिकार्ड में दर्ज नहीं हुई है। प्रार्थिन अपनी जन्म तिथि 01–07–1966 दर्ज करवाना चाहती है, प्रार्थिया ने इस अदालत से प्रार्थना की है कि उसकी जन्म तिथि दर्ज करने के सम्बंधित पंचायत को लिखित आदेश पारित करने की कृपा करें।

अतः इस इश्तहार द्वारा सर्वसाधारण को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उक्त प्रार्थिया की जन्म तिथि ग्रम पंचायत बनोगी के जन्म परिवार रजिस्टर भाग–1 में दर्ज करने बारा कोई उजर / एतराज हो तो वह असालतन / वकालतन तारीख पेशी 05–06–2026 को सुबह 11.00 बजे हाजिर होकर अपना एतराज पेश कर सकता है। निर्धारित अवधि के पश्चात् कोई उजर व एतराज प्राप्त न होने पर प्रार्थना–पत्र स्वीकार किया जाकर ग्रम पंचायत बनोगी, तहसील सैन्ज में उक्त प्रार्थिया की जन्म तिथि 01–07–1966 दर्ज करने के आदेश पारित किए जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 05–05–2026 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी हुआ।

मोहर। हस्ताक्षरित / –
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
तहसील सैंज, जिला कुल्लू (हि0प्र0)।

––––––––––

**ब अदालत श्री चांद राम कश्यप, सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी, तहसील शिमला ग्रामीण, जिला शिमला (हि0प्र0)**

मुकद्दमा संख्या : 36 / 2025 तारीख मरजुआ : 11–08–2025 तारीख पेशी : 03–06–2026

श्री राजेन्दर कुमार पुत्र श्री दम्मू राम, निवासी कान्ता कॉटेज, धोबीघाट मल्याणा, सन्जौली, शिमला–6, तहसील शिमला व जिला शिमला, हिमाचल प्रदेश ..... प्रार्थी।

बनाम

आम जनता

राजस्व अभिलेख में जाति दुरुस्ती बारे पत्र।

श्री राजेन्दर कुमार पुत्र श्री दम्मू राम, निवासी कान्ता कॉटेज, धोबीघाट मल्याणा, सन्जौली, शिमला–6, तहसील शिमला व जिला शिमला, हिमाचल प्रदेश ने इस आशय के साथ प्रस्तुत किया है कि प्रार्थी उप–महाल मल्याणा पटवार वृत्त सन्जौली, शिमला का स्थाई निवासी है और प्रार्थी के मुताबिक शजरा नस्ब मिसल हकीयत हाल में अनुसूचित जाति धोबी से सम्बंद्ध रखता है। जमाबंदी साल 2012–2013 शजरा नस्ब में प्रार्थी की जाति अन्य दर्शायी गई है, जोकि गलत है। प्रार्थी शजरा वर्ष 2012–13 महाल मल्याणा द्वितीय मे जाति अन्य की जगह धोबी दर्ज करके दुरुस्त करना चाहता है।

अतः इशतहार हजा के आदेश के बाद बजरिया इश्तहार द्वारा आम जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को भी उपरोक्त मुकद्दमा राजस्व रिकार्ड में उपरोक्त दुरुस्ती करने बारे कोई उजर व ऐतराज हो तो स्वयं या लिखित तौर पर दिनांक 03–06–2026 को प्रातः 10.00 बजे कोर्ट परिसर चक्कर में या उपरोक्त तिथि से पहले अपना ऐतराज पेश करें अन्यथा एकतफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाएगी।

आज दिनांक 19–05–2026 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर सहित अदालत से जारी किया गया।

मोहर। हस्ताक्षरित / –
सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी,
तहसील शिमला ग्रामीण, जिला शिमला (हि0प्र0)।

————————

**In the Court of Sh. Daya Nand Sharma Executive Magistrate, Grade-II, Rohru, District Shimla (H.P.)**

In the matter of :

Sh. Lhakpa Namgyal s/o Sh. Kalu Ram Negi, r/o Village Ward No. 5, P.O. Rohru, Tehsil Rohru, District Shimla (H.P.) . . *Applicant.*

*Versus*

General Public . . *Respondent.*

*Subject.*—Application under section 13 (3) of Birth and Death Registration Act, 1969.

Whereas, Sh. Lhakpa Namgyal s/o Sh. Kalu Ram Negi, r/o Village Ward No. 5, P.O. Rohru, Tehsil Rohru, District Shimla (H.P.) has filed an application alongwith affidavit in the court of the undersigned under section 13(3) of the Birth & Death Registration Act, 1969 to enter date of birth of his daughter/son 12-01-2004 and 26-03-2009 in the record of Birth Register of Nagar Panchayat Rohru, M.C. Rohru.

Now, therefore, objections are invited from the general public that if anyone has any objection regarding to enter the date of Birth of Miss Tenzin Prema and Master Khenrab Jordhan d/s/o Sh. Lakhpa Namgyal, they should appear before the court of undersigned within 30 days from the publication of this notices, either personally or through their authorized agent.

In the event of their failure to do so, it would be deemed that there is no objection and order shall be passed *ex-parte* without affording any further opportunity of being heard.

Issued under my hand and seal of the court on this 18th May, 2026.

Seal. Sd/-
(DAYA NAND SHARMA),
*Executive Magistrate, Grade-II,*
*Rohru, District Shimla (H.P.).*

**ब अदालत श्री हरिंदर सिंह, कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, जांगला, जिला शिमला (हि0प्र0)**

कुमारी महक पुत्री श्री कुलदीप, निवासी डिस्वाणी, डाकघर कलोटी, उप–तहसील जांगला, जिला शिमला (हि0प्र0) प्रार्थिया।

बनाम

आम जनता

उनवान मुकद्दमा.––प्रार्थना–पत्र जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969 के अन्तर्गत।

इस न्यायालय में कुमारी महक पुत्री श्री कुलदीप, निवासी डिस्वाणी, डाकघर कलोटी, उप–तहसील जांगला, जिला शिमला (हि0प्र0) ने प्रार्थना–पत्र गुजार कर निवेदन किया है कि उसका जन्म 30–12–2013 को हुआ है परन्तु अज्ञानतावश उसका जन्म ग्राम पंचायत डिस्वाणी के जन्म रजिस्टर में आज तक पंजीकृत नहीं किया गया है तथा उसकी जन्म तिथि ग्राम पंचायत डिस्वाणी में दर्ज करने के आदेश दिये जावें।

अतः इश्तहार के माध्यम से आम जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को भी उनकी जन्म तिथि ग्राम पंचायत डिस्वाणी में दर्ज करने बारे कोई एतराज / आपत्ति हो तो वह 18–06–2026 व इससे पूर्व तक असालतन या वकालतन हाजिर होकर इस न्यायालय में आकर अपना एतराज / आपत्ति दर्ज करवा सकता है। एतराज / आपत्ति दर्ज न होने की सूरत में यह समझा जायेगा कि उनकी जन्म तिथि ग्राम पंचायत डिस्वाणी में दर्ज करने हेतु कोई आपत्ति नहीं है तथा जन्म तिथि ग्राम पंचायत डिस्वाणी में दर्ज करने के आदेश पारित कर दिये जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 18–05–2026 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर सहित जारी हुआ।

मोहर। हस्ताक्षरित / –
(हरिंदर सिंह),
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
जांगला, जिला शिमला, हि0प्र0।

————

**In the Court of Sh. Daya Nand Sharma, Executive Magistrate, Grade-II, Rohru, District Shimla (H.P.)**

In the matter of :

Smt. Chetna Devi w/o Sh. Surender Kumar, r/o Village Batari, P.O. Arhal, Tehsil Rohru, District Shimla (H.P.) . . *Applicant.*

*Versus*

General Public . . *Respondent.*

*Subject.*—Application under section 13 (3) of Birth and Death Registration Act, 1969.

Whereas, Smt. Chetna Devi w/o Sh. Surender Kumar, r/o Village Batari, P.O. Arhal, Tehsil Rohru, District Shimla (H.P.) has filed an application alongwith affidavit in the court of the undersigned under section 13(3) of the Birth & Death Registration Act, 1969 to enter her date of Birth 21-11-2013 in the record of Birth Register of Gram Panchayat Arhal.

Now, therefore, objections are invited from the general public that if anyone has any objection regarding to enter the date of Birth of Smt. Chetna Devi w/o Sh. Surender Kumar they should appear before the court of undersigned within 30 days from the publication of this notice, either personally or through their authorized agent.

In the event of their failure to do so, it would be deemed that there is no objection and order shall be passed *ex-parte* without affording any further opportunity of being heard.

Issued under my hand and seal of the court on this 14th May, 2026.

Seal. Sd/-
(DAYA NAND SHARMA),
*Executive Magistrate, Grade-II,*
*Rohru, District Shimla (H.P.).*

---

**In the Court of Sh. Daya Nand Sharma, Executive Magistrate, Grade-II, Rohru, District Shimla (H.P.)**

In the matter of :

Miss Anu Negi d/o Sh. Hari Singh, r/o Village Bautinala, P.O. Rohru, Tehsil Rohru, District Shimla (H.P.) . . *Applicant.*

*Versus*

General Public . . *Respondent.*

*Subject.*—Application under section 13 (3) of Birth and Death Registration Act, 1969.

Whereas, Miss Anu Negi d/o Sh. Hari Singh, r/o Village Bautinala, P.O. Rohru, Tehsil Rohru, District Shimla (H.P.) has filed an application alongwith affidavit in the court of the undersigned under section 13(3) of the Birth & Death Registration Act, 1969 to enter her date of Birth 24-12-1988 in the record of Birth Register of Gram Panchayat Arhal.

Now, therefore, objections are invited from the general public that if anyone has any objection regarding to enter the date of Birth of Miss Anu Negi d/o Sh. Hari Singh they should appear before the court of undersigned within 30 days from the publication of this notice, either personally or through their authorized agent.

In the event of their failure to do so, it would be deemed that there is no objection and order shall be passed *ex-parte* without affording any further opportunity of being heard.

Issued under my hand and seal of the court on this 14th May, 2026.

Seal. Sd/-
(DAYA NAND SHARMA),
*Executive Magistrate, Grade-II,*
*Rohru, District Shimla (H.P.).*

**ब अदालत कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, तहसील कोटखाई, जिला शिमला, हिमाचल प्रदेश**

मिसल सं0 : 1 / 2026 संस्थापन तिथि : 31–03–2026

श्री रेहान पुत्र परवेज, निवासी गांव सल्याणा–प्रथम, डाकघर चलनैर, तहसील कोटखाई, जिला शिमला (हि0प्र0)।

बनाम

आम जनता

विषय.–जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण बारे।

इस अदालत में श्री परवेज पुत्र आलम, निवासी गांव सल्याणा–प्रथम, डाकघर चलनैर, तहसील कोटखाई, जिला शिमला (हि0प्र0) ने जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969 की धारा 13(2 / 3) तथा हिमाचल प्रदेश जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण 9(2 / 3) के अन्तर्गत आवेदन पत्र अतिरिक्त जिला रजिस्ट्रार जन्म एवं मृत्यु, शिमला, जिला शिमला, पत्र संख्या एच.एफ.डब्लू–एस.एम.एल./(B & D)/After/01-04-1970/-2501, दिनांक 27–03–2026 के माध्यम से इस कार्यालय / न्यायालय में प्राप्त हुआ है। जिसमें शपथ–पत्र प्रार्थी व गवाहन, अप्राप्यता प्रमाण–पत्र, आधार कार्ड संलग्न है। जिसमें शपथ–पत्र प्रार्थी व गवाहन के अनुसार श्री रेहान पुत्र परवेज, निवासी गांव सल्याणा, डाकघर चलनैर, तहसील कोटखाई, जिला शिमला (हि0प्र0) का जन्म दिनांक 01–07–2012 को ग्राम सल्याना–1 में हुआ है, लेकिन किसी कारणवश जन्म पंजीकरण ग्राम पंचायत रजिस्टर में दर्ज न हुआ है। जो नियमानुसार दर्ज होना अनिवार्य है। इसलिए प्रार्थी ने अनुरोध किया है कि मेरे पुत्र की जन्म तिथि ग्राम पंचायत दरकोटी में दर्ज / पंजीकृत किए जाने के आदेश दिये जावें।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस इश्तहार के माध्यम से सूचित किया जाता है कि किसी व्यक्ति को इसके सम्बन्ध में कोई उजर / एतराज हो तो वह इस इश्तहार के प्रकाशन की तिथि से एक माह के भीतर इस न्यायालय में असालतन व वकालतन उपस्थित होकर अपनी आपत्ति दर्ज करवाए। एक माह की अवधि के पश्चात् कोई भी आपत्ति / उजर काबिले समायत न होगा तथा जन्म तिथि 01–07–2012 को सम्बन्धित पंचायत के जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण रजिस्टर में दर्ज करने के आदेश जारी कर दिए जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 12–05–2026 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ है।

मोहर। हस्ताक्षरित / –
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
तहसील कोटखाई, जिला शिमला (हि0प्र0)।

———————

**ब अदालत श्री अनिल कुमार, नायब तहसीलदार / कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, तहसील ननखरी, जिला शिमला, हिमाचल प्रदेश**

कृष्णा देवी पुत्री श्री नरमू राम, निवासी गांव टूटू, डाकघर देलठ, तहसील ननखरी, जिला शिमला, हि0प्र0।

बनाम

आम जनता

उनवान मुकद्दमा.––प्रार्थना–पत्र जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969 के तहत ग्राम पंचायत के जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण रजिस्टर में जन्म तिथि दर्ज करवाने बारे।

श्रीमती कृष्णा देवी पुत्री श्री नरमू राम, निवासी गांव टूटू, डाकघर देलठ, तहसील ननखरी, जिला शिमला, हि0प्र0 ने प्रार्थना–पत्र गुजार कर निवेदन किया है कि उसका जन्म दिनांक 12–11–1964 को हुआ था। इस संदर्भ में प्रार्थिया ने अपना शपथ–पत्र भी संलग्न किया है, परन्तु अज्ञानता के कारण प्रार्थिया व उसके परिवार के किसी सदस्य ने निश्चित अवधि में कृष्णा देवी पुत्री श्री नरमू राम का जन्म पंजीकरण स्थानीय ग्राम पंचायत देलठ के अभिलेख में दर्ज नहीं करवाया है। अब प्रार्थिया ग्राम पंचायत देलठ के जन्म व मृत्यु पंजीकरण रजिस्टर में पंजीकरण दर्ज करवाना चाहती है। प्रार्थिया ने अपना ब्यान हल्फिया (स्वयं सत्यापित) परिवार नकल व सचिव द्वारा अप्राप्यता प्रमाण–पत्र प्रस्तुत कर अनुरोध किया है कि उसका जन्म पंजीकरण सम्बन्धित ग्राम पंचायत रिकॉर्ड में दर्ज किया जावे।

अतः इस इश्तहार द्वारा आम जनता तथा सम्बन्धित रिश्तेदारों को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को उपरोक्त जन्म के पंजीकरण का सम्बंधित ग्राम पंचायत के रिकार्ड में दर्ज करने बारा कोई एतराज हो तो दिनांक 12–06–2026 को सुबह 10.00 बजे असालतन / वकालतन हाजिर होकर लिखित व मौखिक एतराज पेश करे अन्यथा उजर / एतराज पेश न होने की सूरत में ग्राम पंचायत देलठ को जन्म तिथि पंजीकरण करने के आदेश पारित कर दिए जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 14–05–2026 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत सहित जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित / –
(अनिल कुमार),
नायब तहसीलदार / कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
तहसील ननखरी, जिला शिमला (हि0प्र0)।

————————

**In the Court of Mukesh Sharma (HAS) Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Kumarsain, District Shimla (H.P.)**

In the matter of :

Mahesh Kumar s/o Sh. Chainu Ram, r/o V.P.O. Kangal, Tehsil Kumarsain, District Shimla (H.P.) . . *Applicant.*

*Versus*

General Public . . *Respondent.*

*Notice/Proclamation Regarding Correction of Name in Aadhar Card of Himanshu.*

Whereas, the above named applicant has submitted an application for the correction of name of his from Baby One of Sunita to Himanshu in the record of Aadhar Card and all other relevant documents associated with the application.

Now, therefore objections are invited from the general public that if, anyone has any objection regarding correction of name as Himanshu in place of Baby One of Sunita, they should appear before the undersigned on or before 13-06-2026 either personally or through their authorized agent/pleader.

In the event of their failure to do so, order shall be passed *ex-parte* without affording any further opportunity of being heard.

Issued today on 14th May, 2026 under my hand and seal of the Court.

Seal. Sd/-
(MUKESH SHARMA, HAS),
*Sub-Divisional Magistrate,*
*Kumarsain, District Shimla (H.P.).*

---

**In the Court of Mukesh Sharma (HAS) Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Kumarsain, District Shimla (H.P.)**

In the matter of :

Hiri Devi w/o Sh. Sunder Singh, r/o Village Bahli, P.O. Bhutti, Tehsil Kumarsain, District Shimla (H.P.) . . *Applicant.*

*Versus*

General Public . . *Respondent.*

*Notice/Proclamation Regarding Correction of Name in Aadhar Card of Hiri Devi.*

Whereas, the above named applicant has submitted an application for the correction of name of her from Madhu to Hiri Devi in the record of Aadhar Card and all other relevant documents associated with the application.

Now, therefore, objections are invited from the general public that if, anyone has any objection regarding change of name as Hiri Devi in place of Madhu, they should appear before the undersigned on or before 13-06-2026 either personally or through their authorized agent/pleader.

In the event of their failure to do so, order shall be passed *ex-parte* without affording any further opportunity of being heard.

Issued today on 14th May, 2026 under my hand and seal of the Court.

Seal. Sd/-
(MUKESH SHARMA, HAS),
*Sub-Divisional Magistrate,*
*Kumarsain, District Shimla (H.P.).*

---

**In the Court of Sh. Mast Ram Bhardwaj, Executive Magistrate, Paonta Sahib, District Sirmaur, Himachal Pradesh**

In the matter of :

Aalok Sharma s/o Sh. Naresh Chand, r/o Village House No. 171/2, Ward No. 10, Krishna Colony, Devinagar, Tehsil Paonta Sahib, District Sirmaur, Himachal Pradesh . . *Applicant.*

*Versus*

General Public . . *Respondent.*

*Subject.—Application for updation of name of applicant from Alok to Aalok in his Aadhar Card.*

Whereas, Aalok Sharma s/o Sh. Naresh Chand, r/o Village House No. 171/2, Ward No. 10, Krishna Colony, Devinagar, Tehsil Paonta Sahib, District Sirmaur, Himachal Pradesh has filed an application alongwith copy of an affidavit and copy of his Aadhar Card in the court of the undersigned for updation of his name as Aalok in place of Alok in his Aadhar Card and for all his intent and purposes.

Now, therefore, objections are invited from the general public that if anyone has any objection regarding updation of name of applicant as Aalok in place of Alok in his Aadhar Card then they should appear before the court of undersigned on or before 20-06-2026, either personally or through their authorized agent.

In the event of their failure to do so, it would be deemed that there are no objections and order shall be passed *ex-parte* without affording any further opportunity of being heard.

Issued under my hand and seal of the court on this 18-05-2026.

Seal.

Sd/-
(MAST RAM BHARDWAJ),
*Tehsildar*-cum-*Executive Magistrate*,
*Paonta Sahib, District Sirmaur (H.P.)*.

---

**Before Marriage Officer**-cum-**Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Nahan, Sub-Division Nahan, District Sirmaur, Himachal Pradesh**

NOTICE UNDER SECTION 16 OF SPECIAL MARRIAGE ACT, 1954

Whereas, Shri Imran Mohammad s/o Sh. Salim Mohammad aged about 25 years, r/o Village Shambhuwala, Tehsil Nahan, District Sirmaur, (H.P.) & Smt. Shivani Chauhan @ Shabnam d/o Sh. Sanjeev Kumar, r/o Village Gavado, P.O. & Tehsil Nahan, District Sirmaur, H.P., have filed an application for the registration of their marriage u/s 15 of the Special Marriage Act, 1954, which was solemnized on 19-05-2025 and they have been living as husband and wife ever since then.

Notices are hereby given to all concerned and general public to this effect that if anybody has got any objection regarding the registration of marriage duly solemnized between above said Shri Imran Mohammad s/o Sh. Salim Mohammad aged about 25 years, r/o Village Shambhuwala, Tehsil Nahan, District Sirmaur (H.P.) & Smt. Shivani Chauhan @ Shabnam d/o Sh. Sanjeev Kumar, r/o Village Gavado, P.O. & Tehsil Nahan, District Sirmaur, H.P. then they should file their written objections and should appear personally or through their authorized agents before me within a period of thirty days from the date of issuence of this notice. After expiry of the said period, the marriage certificate would be issued to the applicants by this court and later on no objection will be heard and accepted.

Issued under my hand and seal of this court on this 14th day of May, 2026.

Seal. Sd/-

*Marriage Officer Under Special Marriage Act,*
-cum-*Sub-Divisional Magistrate,*
*Nahan, District Sirmaur (H.P.).*

---

**ब अदालत कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी (नायब–तहसीलदार), नाहन,**
**जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)**

श्रीमती परीक्षा देवी पुत्री श्री सोहन सिंह, निवासी गांव शाही आर्डर, डा0 एवं ग्राम पंचायत चाकली, नाहन, तहसील नाहन, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)।

बनाम

आम जनता

अदालती इश्तहार / नोटिस

प्रार्थिया श्रीमती परीक्षा देवी पुत्री श्री सोहन सिंह, निवासी गांव शाही आर्डर, डा0 एवं ग्राम पंचायत चाकली, नाहन, तहसील नाहन, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0) ने अधीन धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969 के अन्तर्गत एक आवेदन जिला रजिस्ट्रार (जन्म एवं मृत्यु) / मुख्य चिकित्सा अधिकारी, जिला सिरमौर स्थित नाहन के पत्र क्रमांक HFW-N/ST/B&D/Delayed Cases/2025-8983, दिनांक 13–10–2025 अनुलग्न क्रमशः अपना ब्यान हल्फी, आधार कार्ड, दो गवाहन के ब्यान हल्फी, अनुपलब्धता प्रमाण–पत्र रजिस्ट्रार जन्म एवं मृत्यु ग्राम पंचायत चाकली, तहसील नाहन, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0), रिपोर्ट ग्राम पंचायत चाकली, प्रति परिवार रजिस्टर एवं अन्य कागजात सहित इस अदालत में प्राप्त हुआ है जिसमें प्रार्थिया ने आवेदन किया है कि उसकी जन्म तिथि 20–06–1970 है, जिसे वह एवं उसका परिवार अज्ञानतावश ग्राम पंचायत में दर्ज न करवा सके हैं। अब वह अपनी जन्म तिथि उक्त ग्राम पंचायत चाकली, तहसील नाहन, जिला सिरमौर, हि0 प्र0 में दर्ज करवाना चाहती है।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस इश्तहार / नोटिस द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि इस सम्बन्ध में यदि किसी व्यक्ति को कोई उजर या एतराज हो तो वह स्वयं अथवा अपने प्रतिनिधि द्वारा दिनांक 02–06–2026 को प्रातः 10.00 बजे अदालत में हाजिर होकर अपना एतराज प्रस्तुत कर सकता है। अगर उक्त तारीख तक किसी का उजर या एतराज प्राप्त नहीं होता तो श्रीमती परीक्षा देवी पुत्री श्री सोहन सिंह एवं श्रीमती सोमी की जन्म तिथि 20–06–1970, ग्राम पंचायत चाकली, तहसील नाहन, जिला सिरमौर, हि0प्र0 में दर्ज करने के आदेश जारी कर दिये जावेंगे

आज दिनांक 02–05–2025 को हमारे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर। हस्ताक्षरित / –
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी (नायब तहसीलदार),
नाहन, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)।

---

**ब अदालत श्री रविन्द्र कुमार सिसोदिया, सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी, पांवटा साहिब,**
**जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)**

मिसल नं0 : 803021 / 2026 दायर तिथि : 04–02–2026

श्री हंसराज पुत्र श्री सावन सिंह, निवासी मानपुर देवडा, तहसील पांवटा साहिब, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रार्थना–पत्र भू–राजस्व अधिनियम 1954 की धारा 37(1) के तहत नाम दुरुस्ती बारे।

प्रार्थी श्री हंसराज पुत्र श्री सावन सिंह, निवासी मानपुर देवडा, तहसील पांवटा साहिब, जिला सिरमौर, (हि0प्र0) ने इस अदालत में एक प्रार्थना–पत्र मय ब्यान हल्फीया, परिवार नकल, जमाबन्दी पटवार वृत्त गोरखूवाला, मौजा मानपुर देवडा, वर्ष 2018–19 व आधार कार्ड सहित इस कार्यालय में प्रस्तुत किया है। जिसमे प्रार्थी द्वारा निवेदन किया है कि पटवार वृत्त गोरखूवाला के राजस्व ग्राम मानपुर देवडा में प्रार्थी के पिता का नाम सूफी दर्ज हो गया है, जबकि प्रार्थी के पिता का सही नाम श्री सावन सिंह पुत्र श्री बिशना सिंह है, जिसे प्रार्थी पटवार वृत्त गोरखूवाला के मौजा मानपुर देवडा में सूफी की जगह सही नाम सावन सिंह पुत्र बिशना सिंह दुरुस्त करवाना चाहता है।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस इश्तहार के मार्फत सूचित किया जाता है कि इस बारे किसी को कोई उजर / एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 30–05–2026 या इससे पूर्व किसी भी कार्यदिवस में अदालत हजा स्थित पांवटा साहिब में असालतन या वकालतन हाजिर आकर आपत्ति दर्ज करा सकता है। अन्यथा उजर / एतराज पेश न होने की सूरत में उक्त नाम की दुरुस्ती राजस्व अभिलेख में करने के आदेश पारित कर दिए जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 30–04–2026 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर एवं कार्यालय मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी किया गया।

मोहर। हस्ताक्षरित / –
सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी,
पांवटा साहिब, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)।

———————

**ब अदालत श्री रविन्द्र कुमार सिसोदिया, सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी, पांवटा साहिब, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)**

श्री जालम सिंह पुत्र श्री ध्यान सिंह, निवासी नया कोट, तहसील पांवटा साहिब, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रार्थना–पत्र भू–राजस्व अधिनियम 1954 की धारा 37(1) के तहत नाम दुरुस्ती बारे।

प्रार्थी श्री जालम सिंह पुत्र श्री ध्यान सिंह, निवासी नया कोट, तहसील पांवटा साहिब, जिला सिरमौर, (हि0प्र0) ने इस अदालत में एक प्रार्थना–पत्र मय ब्यान हल्फीया, आधार कार्ड, परिवार नकल सहित इस कार्यालय में प्रस्तुत किया है। जिसमें प्रार्थी ने निवेदन किया है कि उसके आधारकार्ड में उसकी पत्नी का नाम गंगा देवी पत्नी जालम सिंह दर्ज है, जोकि गलत है। जबकि परिवार नकल में उसकी पत्नी का नाम गंगी देवी पत्नी जालम सिंह दर्ज है, जोकि सही है व प्रार्थी ने आधारकार्ड में अपनी पत्नी का नाम गंगा देवी की जगह गंगी देवी पत्नी जालम सिंह दर्ज करने का आग्रह किया है।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस इश्तहार के मार्फत सूचित किया जाता है कि इस बारे किसी को कोई उजर / एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 06–07–2026 या इससे पूर्व किसी भी कार्यदिवस में अदालत हजा स्थित

पांवटा साहिब में असालतन या वकालतन हाजिर आकर आपत्ति दर्ज करा सकता है। अन्यथा उजर / एतराज पेश न होने की सूरत में उक्त नाम की दुरुस्ती आधार कार्ड में करने के आदेश पारित कर दिए जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 06–05–2026 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर एवं कार्यालय मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी किया गया।

मोहर। हस्ताक्षरित / –
सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी,
पांवटा साहिब, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)।

————————

**In the Court of Sh. Dwij Goel, IAS, Marriage Officer-cum-Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Paonta Sahib, District Sirmaur, Himachal Pradesh**

In the matter of :

1. Sh. Sandeep Singh s/o Sh. Manjeet Singh, r/o Mehmoodpur (71), Ambala, Haryana-133 104.

2. Satwant Kaur d/o Sh. Charan Singh, r/o Village Amarkot (97), Nihalgarh, Tehsil Paonta Sahib, District Sirmaur (H.P.).

*Versus*

General Public

*Subject.—Application for registration of marriage under section 15 of Special Marriage Act, 1954.*

Sh. Sandeep Singh s/o Sh. Manjeet Singh, r/o Mehmoodpur (71), Ambala, Haryana-133 104 and Satwant Kaur d/o Sh. Charan Singh, r/o Village Amarkot (97), Nihalgarh, Tehsil Paonta Sahib, District Sirmaur (H.P.) has filed an application alongwith affidavits in this court under section 15 of Special Marriage Act, 1954 and stating therein that they have solemnized their marriage on 25-02-2018 and they have been living together as husband and wife ever since then. Hence notices are given to all concerned and General Public to this effect that if anybody have any objection regarding the registration of marriage duly solemnized on 25-02-2018 between Sh. Sandeep Singh s/o Sh. Manjeet Singh, r/o Mehmoodpur (71), Ambala, Haryana-133 104 and Satwant Kaur d/o Sh. Charan Singh, r/o Village Amarkot (97), Nihalgarh, Tehsil Paonta Sahib, District Sirmaur (H.P.) he/she should file written objections and appear personally or through an authorized agent before this court within 30 days from the date of issue of this notice. After expiry of the said period the marriage certificate would be issued to the applicants by this court.

Issued under my hand and official seal of the court on 12-05-2026.

Seal. Sd/-
(DWIJ GOEL, IAS),
*Marriage Officer*-cum-*SDM,*
*Paonta Sahib, District Sirmaur (H.P.).*

**In the Court of Sh. Mast Ram Bhardwaj, Executive Magistrate, Paonta Sahib, District Sirmaur, Himachal Pradesh**

In the matter of :

Miss Robina d/o Sh. Jeet Singh, r/o Village Dhadhas, Tehsil Shillai, District Sirmaur, Himachal Pradesh . . *Applicant.*

*Versus*

General Public . . *Respondent.*

*Subject.—Application for updation of name of applicant from Ravina to Robina and name of her father as Jeet Singh in place of Kediya in her Aadhar Card.*

Whereas, Miss Robina d/o Sh. Jeet Singh, r/o Village Dhadhas, Tehsil Shillai, District Sirmaur, Himachal Pradesh has filed an application alongwith copy of an affidavit and copy of her Himachali Bonafide Certificate in the court of the undersigned for updation of her own and her father's name as Robina and Jeet Singh in place of Ravina and Kediya respectively in her Aadhar Card and for all his intent and purposes.

Now, therefore, objections are invited from the general public that if anyone has any objection regarding updation of name of applicant as Robina and her father's name as Jeet Singh in place of Ravina and Kediya respectively in her Aadhar Card then they should appear before the court of undersigned on or before 16-06-2026, either personally or through their authorized agent.

In the event of their failure to do so, it would be deemed that there are no objections and order shall be passed *ex-parte* without affording any further opportunity of being heard.

Issued under my hand and seal of the court on this 14-05-2026.

Seal.

Sd/-
(MAST RAM BHARDWAJ),
*Tehsildar*-cum-*Executive Magistrate*,
*Paonta Sahib, District Sirmaur (H.P.)*.

---

**ब अदालत नायब तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, उप–तहसील नारग, जिला सिरमौर, हिमाचल प्रदेश**

श्री संजू पुत्र श्री टिलू राम, निवासी ग्राम चाकला, डाकघर व उप–तहसील नारग, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)।

बनाम

आम जनता

दरख्वास्त जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

श्री संजू पुत्र श्री टिलू राम, निवासी ग्राम चाकला, डाकघर व उप–तहसील नारग, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0) ने इस अदालत में प्रार्थना–पत्र मय शपथ–पत्र गुजारा है कि उनकी माता की मृत्यु दिनांक 24–07–2016 को हुई थी, जिसका इन्द्राज ग्राम पंचायत दीद घलूत, उप–तहसील नारग, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0) में किन्हीं कारणों से दर्ज नहीं हुआ है।

अतः इस इश्तहार द्वारा आम व खास को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को उक्त मृत्यु पंजीकरण तिथि पंचायत रिकार्ड में दर्ज करने बारे कोई एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 04–06–2026 को या इससे पूर्व अदालत में हाजिर होकर अपना एतराज पेश कर सकता है अन्यथा सचिव, ग्राम पंचायत को सम्बंधित उक्त मृत्यु तिथि दर्ज करने बारे आदेश जारी कर दिये जायेंगे।

आज दिनांक 05–05–2026 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर। हस्ताक्षरित / –
नायब तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
उप–तहसील नारग, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)।

————————

**ब अदालत नायब तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, उप–तहसील नारग, जिला सिरमौर, हिमाचल प्रदेश**

जरिना पुत्री श्री गुलजार मुहम्मद, निवासी ग्राम (कुज्जी) बकसार, डा0 कुज्जी, उप–तहसील नारग, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)।

बनाम

आम जनता

दरख्वास्त जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

जरिना पुत्री श्री गुलजार मुहम्मद, निवासी ग्राम (कुज्जी) बकसार, डा0 कुज्जी, उप–तहसील नारग, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0) ने इस अदालत में प्रार्थना–पत्र मय शपथ–पत्र गुजारा है कि उनका जन्म दिनांक 12–03–1972 को हुआ था, जिसका इन्द्राज ग्राम पंचायत डिलमन, उप–तहसील नारग, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0) में किन्हीं कारणों से दर्ज नहीं हुआ है।

अतः इस इश्तहार द्वारा आम व खास को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को उक्त जन्म पंजीकरण तिथि पंचायत रिकार्ड में दर्ज करने बारे कोई एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 04–06–2026 को या इससे पूर्व अदालत में हाजिर होकर अपना एतराज पेश कर सकता है अन्यथा सचिव, ग्राम पंचायत को सम्बंधित उक्त जन्म तिथि दर्ज करने बारे आदेश जारी कर दिये जायेंगे।

आज दिनांक 05–05–2026 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर। हस्ताक्षरित / –
नायब तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
उप–तहसील नारग, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)।

————————

**ब अदालत श्री जय कृष्ण, कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, उप–तहसील रोनहाट, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)**

ब मुकद्दमा :

श्री श्याम सिंह पुत्र श्री बारू राम, निवासी ग्राम जासवी, डाकघर कोटि बौंच, ग्राम पंचायत अजरोली, उप–तहसील रोनहाट, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)।

बनाम

आम जनता

विषय.–दरख्वास्त जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु रजिस्ट्रीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

श्री श्याम सिंह पुत्र श्री बारू राम, निवासी ग्राम जासवी, डाकघर कोटि बौंच, ग्राम पंचायत अजरोली, उप–तहसील रोनहाट, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0) का आवेदन जिला रजिस्ट्रार (जन्म एवं मृत्यु) एवं मुख्य चिकित्सा अधिकारी नाहन के पत्र क्रमांक HFW-N/ST/B & D/Delayed Cases/2026-601,dated 22–04–2026 के द्वारा प्राप्त हुआ है जिसमें प्रार्थी अपनी पुत्री श्रुति की जन्म तिथि 12–12–2012 को ग्राम पंचायत अजरोली के जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण राजिस्टर में दर्ज करवाना चाहता है जिसका रिकार्ड पंचायत में दर्ज नहीं किया गया है जिसकी पुष्टि हेतु प्रार्थी ने आवेदन–पत्र में मय ब्यान हल्फी, प्रपत्र 10, आधार कार्ड परिवार नकल इत्यादि संलग्न किए हैं तथा जिला रजिस्ट्रार (जन्म एवं मृत्यु) एवं मुख्य चिकित्सा अधिकारी नाहन, जिला सिरमौर द्वारा अपनी संस्तुति प्रस्तुत की है।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस इश्तहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि श्याम सिंह पुत्र श्री बारू राम, निवासी ग्राम जासवी, डाकघर कोटि बौंच, ग्राम पंचायत अजरोली की पुत्री श्रुति की जन्म तिथि 12–12–2012 को ग्राम पंचायत अजरोली, विकास खण्ड शिलाई के कार्यालय के अभिलेख में दर्ज करने बारे अगर किसी को आपत्ति हो तो वह असालतन या वकालतन अपनी आपत्ति व दावा इस अदालत में दिनांक 05–06–2026 सायं 5.00 बजे तक करवा सकता है निर्धारित अवधि में आपत्ति न आने की सूरत में प्रार्थी श्याम सिंह की पुत्री श्रुति की जन्म तिथि 12–12–2012 को ग्राम पंचायत अजरोली, विकास खण्ड शिलाई के जन्म एवं मृत्यु अभिलेख में दर्ज करने के आदेश सम्बन्धित स्थानीय जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीपाल को पारित कर दिए जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 05–05–2026 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व कार्यालय मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी किया गया।

मोहर। हस्ताक्षरित / –
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
उप–तहसील रोनहाट, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)।

———————

**ब अदालत श्री जय कृष्ण, कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, उप–तहसील रोनहाट, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)**

ब मुकद्दमा :

श्री राजू पुत्र श्री चनिया राम, निवासी ग्राम बडिधार, डाकघर झाकन्डो, ग्राम पंचायत धारवा, उप–तहसील रोनहाट, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)।

बनाम

आम जनता

विषय.–दरख्वास्त जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु रजिस्ट्रीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

श्री राजू पुत्र श्री चनिया राम, निवासी ग्राम बडिधार, डाकघर झाकन्डो, ग्राम पंचायत धारवा, उप–तहसील रोनहाट, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0) का आवेदन जिला रजिस्ट्रार (जन्म एवं मृत्यु) एवं मुख्य चिकित्सा अधिकारी नाहन के पत्र क्रमांक HFW-N/ST/B &D/Delayed Cases/2026-603, dated 22–04–2026 के द्वारा प्राप्त हुआ है जिसमें प्रार्थी अपनी पुत्री अंशिका वर्मा की जन्म तिथि 13–06–2024 को

ग्राम पंचायत धारवा के जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण राजिस्टर में दर्ज करवाना चाहता है जिसका रिकार्ड पंचायत में दर्ज नहीं किया गया है जिसकी पुष्टि हेतु प्रार्थी ने आवेदन–पत्र में मय ब्यान हल्फी, प्रपत्र 10, आधार कार्ड परिवार नकल इत्यादि संलग्न किए हैं तथा जिला रजिस्ट्रार (जन्म एवं मृत्यु) एवं मुख्य चिकित्सा अधिकारी नाहन, जिला सिरमौर द्वारा अपनी संस्तुति प्रस्तुत की है।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस इश्तहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि राजू पुत्र श्री चनिया राम, निवासी ग्राम बडिधार, डाकघर झाकन्डो, ग्राम पंचायत धारवा की पुत्री अंशिका वर्मा की जन्म तिथि 13–06–2024 को ग्राम पंचायत धारवा, विकास खण्ड शिलाई के कार्यालय के अभिलेख में दर्ज करने बारे अगर किसी को आपत्ति हो तो वह असालतन या वकालतन अपनी आपत्ति व दावा इस अदालत में दिनांक 05–06–2026 सायं 5.00 बजे तक करवा सकता है निर्धारित अवधि में आपत्ति न आने की सूरत में प्रार्थी राजू की पुत्री अंशिका वर्मा की जन्म तिथि 13–06–2024 को ग्राम पंचायत धारवा, विकास खण्ड शिलाई के जन्म एवं मृत्यु अभिलेख में दर्ज करने के आदेश सम्बन्धित स्थानीय जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीपाल को पारित कर दिए जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 05–05–2026 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व कार्यालय मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी किया गया।

मोहर। हस्ताक्षरित/–
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
उप–तहसील रोनहाट, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)।

————————

**ब अदालत कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी गगरेट स्थित कलोह, उप–तहसील गगरेट स्थित कलोह, जिला ऊना (हि0प्र0)**

विवाह पंजीकरण

1. श्री अजय पुत्र श्री धर्म पाल, निवासी गगरेट, उप–तहसील गगरेट स्थित कलोह, जिला ऊना (हि0प्र0)।

2. श्रीमती पूनम पुत्री श्री प्रकाश चन्द, वासी गांव व डाकघर अंदोरा, तहसील अम्ब, जिला ऊना, (हि0प्र0) हाल पत्नी अजय पुत्र श्री धर्म पाल, निवासी गगरेट, उप–तहसील गगरेट स्थित कलोह, जिला ऊना (हि0प्र0) प्रार्थीगण।

बनाम

आम जनता

विषय.––प्रार्थना–पत्र अधीन धारा 8(4) विवाह पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1996.

श्री अजय पुत्र श्री धर्म पाल, निवासी गगरेट, उप–तहसील गगरेट स्थित कलोह, जिला ऊना (हि0प्र0) व श्रीमती पूनम पुत्री श्री प्रकाश चन्द, वासी गांव व डाकघर अंदोरा, तहसील अम्ब, जिला ऊना, (हि0प्र0) हाल पत्नी अजय पुत्र श्री धर्म पाल, निवासी गगरेट, उप–तहसील गगरेट स्थित कलोह, जिला ऊना (हि0प्र0) ने इस न्यायालय में प्रार्थना–पत्र मय शपथ–पत्र पेश किया है कि उनकी शादी दिनांक 31–01–2013 को मुताबिक हिन्दू रीति–रिवाज से हुई थी, परन्तु अज्ञानतावश शादी का पंजीकरण नगर पंचायत अप्पर गगरेट के अभिलेख में नहीं करवाया है। अतः अब प्रार्थीगण अपनी शादी का पंजीकरण ग्राम पंचायत अप्पर गगरेट के अभिलेख में दर्ज करवाना चाहते हैं।

अतः आम जनता को इस इश्तहार/मुश्त्री मुनादी द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी भी व्यक्ति को उक्त शादी दर्ज करने बारे कोई उजर या एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 06–06–2026 को दोपहर

02.00 बजे या इससे पूर्व असालतन या वकालतन हाजिर अदालत होकर पेश करें। गैर–हाजिरी की सूरत में एकतरफा कार्यवाही करके नियमानुसार सम्बन्धित ग्राम पंचायत को शादी दर्ज करने के आदेश जारी कर दिए जांएगें।

आज दिनांक –05–2026 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी हुआ।

मोहर। हस्ताक्षरित / –
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी गगरेट स्थित कलोह,
उप–तहसील गगरेट, जिला ऊना (हि0प्र0)।

————————

**ब अदालत नायब तहसीलदार एवं सहायक समाहर्ता (द्वितीय वर्ग), उप–तहसील बीहडू कलां, जिला ऊना (हि0प्र0)**

तारीख पेशी : 09–06–2026 मुकद्दमा नं0 : 19 / NTBC / 2025 किस्म दावाः नाम दुरुस्ती

श्रीमती संध्या देवी

बनाम

आम जनता

विषय.–प्रार्थना–पत्र नाम दुरूस्ती करवाने बारे।

उपरोक्त मुकद्दमा में प्रार्थिया श्रीमती संध्या देवी विधवा मंदर चन्द पुत्र मुंशी ने एक प्रार्थना पत्र बराये अपने पति मंदर चन्द का नाम दुरूस्ती इस न्यायालय में दायर किया है जिसमें उसने अपने पति का नाम मंदर चन्द पुत्र मुंशी बताया है। जबकि उसका नाम राजस्व अभिलेख महाल मकरैड़, जमाबन्दी वर्ष 2021–22 के अनुसार महिन्दर चन्द दर्ज है प्रार्थिया अपने पति का नाम महिन्दर चन्द की बजाए महिन्दर चन्द उपनाम मंदर चन्द करवाना चाहती है।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस इश्तहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को राजस्व अभिलेख महाल मकरैड़, उप–तहसील बीहडू कलां, जिला ऊना (हि0प्र0) में इस नाम दुरुस्ती बारे कोई आपत्ति / एतराज हो तो वह निर्धारित तिथि पेशी 09–06–2026 या इससे पूर्व असालतन या वकालतन अदालत हजा में हाजिर आकर अपना एतराज प्रस्तुत कर सकता है। एतराज न प्राप्त होने की सूरत में हस्ब जाबता कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाकर मुकद्दमा का निर्णय कर दिया जाएगा।

आज दिनांक 04–05–2026 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी किया गया।

मोहर। हस्ताक्षरित / –
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
उप–तहसील बीहडू कलां, जिला ऊना (हि0प्र0)।

————————

## CHANGE OF NAME

I, Abhishek Sharma s/o Sh. Mohinder Pal, r/o Ward No. 07, Village Dehlan Lower, Sub-Tehsil Mehatpur Basdehra, Distt. Una (H.P.) hereby declare that I have changed my name from Abhishek to Abhishek Sharma. All concerned may please note.

ABHISHEK SHARMA
*s/o Sh. Mohinder Pal,*
*r/o Ward No. 07, Village Dehlan Lower,*
*Sub-Tehsil Mehatpur Basdehra, Distt. Una (H.P.).*

## CHANGE OF NAME

I, Neelam w/o Late Sh. Jaswant Singh, r/o Ward No. 07, Village Jhorowal, P.O. Jankaur, Tehsil & Distt. Una (H.P.) hereby declare that in my son's Aadhar Card No. 3172 0586 3428, his name has been wrongly mentioned as Shiv Kumar instead of his correct name Ashiv Kumar. All concerned please note.

NEELAM
*w/o Late Sh. Jaswant Singh,*
*r/o Ward No. 07, Village Jhorowal,*
*P.O. Jankaur, Tehsil & Distt. Una (H.P.).*

---

## CHANGE OF NAME

I, Prakash Chand (New Name) s/o Sh. Mehar Singh, r/o Ward No. 07, Village, P.O. & Tehsil Chopal, Distt. Shimla (H.P.)-171 211 declare that I have changed my name from Parkash Chand (previous name) to Prakash Chand (New Name). All concerned please may note.

PRAKASH CHAND
*s/o Sh. Mehar Singh,*
*r/o Ward No. 07,*
*Village , P.O. & Tehsil Chopal,*
*Distt. Shimla (H.P.)-171 211.*

---

## CHANGE OF NAME

I, Rajender Singh s/o Late Sh. Bala Nand, r/o Village Pujali (120), P.O. Kalbog, Tehsil Kotkhai, Distt. Shimla (H.P.) declare that in my Aadhar Card my name is wrongly entered as Rajender Singh, which should be corrected as Rajinder Sharma. Please correct this.

RAJENDER SINGH
*s/o Late Sh. Bala Nand,*
*r/o Village Pujali (120), P.O. Kalbog,*
*Tehsil Kotkhai, Distt. Shimla (H.P.).*

---

## CHANGE OF NAME

I, Suman (49) d/o Sh. Puran Ram, w/o Sh. Mohinder Pal, r/o Set No. 5, Tennis Court, H.P.U. Campus Himachal Pradesh University, Summer Hill Shimla, Urban (T), Himachal Pradesh Pin-171 005, declare that I have changed my name from Soma Devi to Suman. All concerned please note.

SUMAN
*d/o Sh. Puran Ram,*
*w/o Sh. Mohinder Pal,*
*r/o Set No. 5, Tennis Court,*
*H.P.U. Campus Himachal Pradesh*
*University, Summer Hill Shimla,*
*Urban (T), Himachal Pradesh Pin-171 005.*

## CHANGE OF NAME

I, Satish Kumar s/o Sh. Layak Ram, r/o Vill. sharli Manpur, Tehsil Kamrau, Distt. Sirmaur (H.P.) declare that I have changed my minor son's name from "Distant Sharma" to "Dishant Sharma". Please note all concerned for further.

SATISH KUMAR
*s/o Sh. Layak Ram,*
*r/o Vill. sharli Manpur,*
*Tehsil Kamrau, Distt. Sirmaur (H.P.).*

---

नियन्त्रक, मुद्रण तथा लेखन सामग्री, हिमाचल प्रदेश, शिमला–5 द्वारा मुद्रित तथा प्रकाशित
इलेक्ट्रॉनिक हस्ताक्षरित राजपत्र, वैबसाइट https://rajpatra.hp.gov.in पर उपलब्ध है एवम् ऑनलाइन सत्यापित किया जा सकता है।